Mr. BAXTERS APHORISMS EXORIZED AND ANTHORIZED.

OR

An Examination of, and Answer to a Book written by Mr. Ri: Baxter Teacher of the Church at Kederminster in worcester-shire, entituled, Aphorisms of Justification.

TOGETHER WITH

A vindication of Justification by meer Grace, from all the Popish and Arminian Sophism, by which that Author labours to ground it upon Mans Works and Righteousness.

By JOHN CRANDON an unworthy Minister of the Gospel of Christ at *Fawley* in *Hant-shire*.

Ipse fecit nos, & non ipsi nos. Ipsi nos justos & salvos fecit & non ipsi nos. August. de verbis Apostoli. Serm. 11.

God forbid that I should glory, save in the Crosse of our Lord Jesus Christ. Gal. 6. 14.

LONDON;
Printed for *William Ley*, and are to be sold at his Shop at *Pauls* Chain, 1656.

p. 9

1490 p. 86



W.m Westby Esq.

F 5 18

(C-1807a)

(viii), 389, 29b, (viii)pp

(viii), 389, 29b. pt. cancelled.
Wk. 2d pt. wanting
one plate pt 2 KKK.
also 9th

Mr. *BAXTERS*

APHORISMS *EXORIZED AND ANTHORIZED.*

OR

An Examination of, and Answer to a Book written by Mr. *Ri: Baxter* Teacher of the Church at *Kederminster* in *worcester-shire*, entituled, *Aphorisms of Justification.*

TOGETHER WITH

A vindication of Justification by meer Grace, from all the Popish and Arminian Sophisms, by which that Author labours to ground it upon Mans Works and Righteousness.

By JOHN CRANDON an unworthy Minister of the Gospel of Christ at *Fawley* in *Hant-shire.*

Ipse fecit nos, & non ipsi nos. Ipsi nos justos & salvos fecit & non ipsi nos. Augustin. de verbis Apostoli. Serm. 11.

God forbid that I should glory, save in the Crosse of our Lord Jesus Christ. Gal. 6. 14.

LONDON;
Printed for *William Ley*, and are to be sold at his Shop at *Pauls* Chain, 1656.

APHORISMS

EXAMINED AND

ANIMADVERTED.

An Examination of, and Answer to a

A vindication of Justification by Imputation

PENNSYLVANIA 15 MAY 6

TO THE REVEREND, THE FAITHFULL AND Pious MINISTERS of the Lord Christ within this Nation.

Much honoured and highly Beloved.

IT might be Construed self-arrogance, that so despicable a person in parts, newly broken out of the black Cloud of Obscurity, should (not onely publish to the world, but withall) tender so rough-hewen a work to the speciall view & scrutiny of them whom Christ hath made and *named the Lights of the world.* But this imputation will appear undeserved, to as many as shall consider that what is here presented to so great a fulgor of judgement and learning, comes with a request not of Patronage alone, but of Correction also. Of Patronage where it defends the Truth in the Truth: of Correction where it halteth into the defence of error in stead of the Truth, or of the Truth but not in the Truth. The work it self will sufficiently speak me out not fit to be registred *inter Doctos*, yet hath it been still my study not to commit any thing by which I should deserve to be pronounced *indoctus*, untractable to learn where the

Lord holds forth a faithfull Teacher. It is the height of my ambition and patheticall heartineſs of my humble requeſt, not ſo much to all of you Collectively (which is unattainable) as to every of you diviſively, who in theſe ſlippery times (Honored Worthies) ſtand faſt in the truth of Chriſt, to be recalled by you into the way from which you ſhall finde me any where ſtraying: but ſo that by the Authority of the Word you lead me into it, that I may gladly be a follower of ſuch a leader. As to the Book to which this anſwereth, whatſoever Fate this ſhall have in mens judgements, ſurely that muſt have a ſtinch with all the judicious and orthodox. Neither could it ſo long have ſtood unſhaken, had he not cunningly prepoſſeſſed the minds of his Readers with Affection and prejudice, the two worſt Clouds which oft bemiſt the judgement of them that are both pious and prudent, that in ſeeing they do not, becauſe they would not perceive the truth for a ſeaſon. The Affections of many he attracted to himſelf by profeſſing himſelf a zealous Presbyterian. This pretext made not a few to look over and beyond his Contagious doctrine, to behold and regard the perſon of the man for his unanimity with them in diſcipline. This vizzard is at length ſo faln from his Face that the moſt do and all may ſee him under this profeſſion, to have been but as the Anabaptized Jeſuit, taking his ſtation there from whence he thought to have moſt advantage to promote his Popiſh doctrines, Concluding that under that name his Fraud would not be ſo eaſily eſpyed. And is there now any which ſeeth not he would be Epiſcopal, Presbyterian, Independent, for any Government, for no Government, helping him to drive home to the head his ſoul-ſubverting doctrines into the hearts of men? Prejudice againſt the ſacred Truth which he oppugneth, he fomented by aſperſing the whole Doctrine of the Goſpel and the reformed Churches of Chriſt with the black brand of Antinomi-

nonianiſm, reſerving onely the *Papiſts* and *Arminians*, whom he followeth, free of it. How much he hath prevailed in ſowring with the leaven of Scribes and Phariſees which is hypocriſie, the vulgar ſort not onely of the people, but of the Miniſters alſo, with this groſs impoſture, would be incredible, if experience did not manifeſt it: Therefore finding this Feat ſo ſoveraign to the attainment of his ends, aſſoon as he heard of exceptions in the Preſs againſt his Aphoriſms, his firſt indeavours have been to fill with prejudice the minds of men againſt the both work and Author thereof, diſperſing thorow this Citty by his Printer that it is the Hant-ſhire Antinomian that excepteth ſo againſt him. How irrational and malicious this his inditement againſt me is, may appear hence, that I dwell in one of the obſcureſt nooks of this Engliſh little world, ſo unknown as he is famous, that he could not ſo much as hear of my name, ſaving by ſome one of his Circumforaneous Legates (which having their Provinces aſſigned either of one or more Counties, are ſtill Circling and Compaſſing them, firſt to diſperſe this his Myſtery of iniquity with ſuch accurateneſs, that there may be no one that hath the repute of a pious Gentleman or Miniſter a ſtranger to it; and then by their frequent viſitations to examine how the Baxterian Faith thrives in each perſon, and to hold them fixed to it) Theſe returning once in ſix or ſeven Moneths out of their Circuits to their Grand Maſter may poſſibly ſpeak in things which they know not, what they think may be plauſible to him. It hath not been unknown (I acknowledge) to ſome of theſe that I diſreliſhed his doctrine, and did hinder the embracing of it: But might not this my diſſenting be as properly termed Treaſon as Antinonianiſm?

Yet becauſe I underſtand that theſe ſparkes of falſe-fire have no ſooner faln than taken in ſome, I am forced to Apologize ſomewhat (and that with the more Confidence becauſe

becauſe to you that have the eyes of your underſtanding moſt clear rightly to Cenſure or judge) that prejudice may be no hinderance to the truth. What I ſhall ſpeak herein muſt relate partly to my ſelf, partly to Mr. *Br.* and partly to the doctrine it ſelf which he hath drawn into Controverſie Condemning it of Antinomiſm.

1 What I ſhall ſpeak of my ſelf ſhall not be with an heart and a heart, the one open to let out what it liſteth, the other reſerved to retein in ſecrecy what is not for advantage to the ends ſought after: but in plainneſs and ſimplicity I ſhall deliver the whole and naked truth of my judgement as before the Lord my Judge and Juſtifier. Neither is there need of hiding and Tergiverſation, *for I am not aſhamed of the Goſpel of Chriſt: It is the power of God to ſalvation* &c. And as ſweet to me as the ſalvation which it bringeth. I therefore profeſs my ſelf clear from all that is rightly Called, and hath been judged by the reformed Churches and their Champions Antinonianiſm, *i. e.* oppoſiteneſs to the Law. Theſe things I acknowledg my ſelf to hold and teach: 1 That Beleevers are not under the Curſe of the Law as the Curſe. 2 Nor are the Afflictions which befall them ſo the Curſe of the Law, or revenging puniſhments for ſinn, but the fruits of the tender Love of a good and provident Father, working for good to them. 3 That they are not under the Law as a Covenant of works. If theſe things be Antinoniſm I acknowledg my ſelf an Antinomian: yet ſuch as onely the blindneſs madneſs and malice of men poſſibly may account ſo, but that I have the Apoſtles and all the Proteſtant Churches and Writers (without any exception) under the ſame aſperſion with me, having all ſtoutly maintained all theſe as Goſpel-truths againſt the falſe Apoſtles, Papiſts, and Arminians, in their ſeverall generations, without the Contradiction of any except Papiſts and Arminians, to whom Mr. *Br.* not without ſome fellowes, hath lately

lately Apostatized. 4 Yet I still grant the preaching of the Law, and that in its full perfection and all its terrors, usefull to shake in pieces all the carnall Confidences and self-righteousnes of man, that despairing of safety in himself, he may be forced to seek it out of himself from meer Mercy, in another which is Christ the Saviour. 5. That the Law is still a perfect rule and directive of all morall righteousnes and obedience both to beleevers and unbeleevers, so that in both all variation from it is sinn, but Conformity to it is regularity and obedience. In respect of my judgement therefore about the Law, I question not my discharge from the imputation of Antinomism among the truly wise and orthodox, except to be a Christian be Antinomianism.

2 As to Mr. *Br*, it is evident that he asperseth the innocent with the Fault whereof himself is guilty. He denies Christ to require under the Gospel, the perfect holines and righteousnes which the Law commandeth, and Consequently that it is not either our duty to perform it, or our sinn to fail in it, or that the Law is an adequate and Competent rule of morall obedience, Because it Commands more than it is our duty to perform. He saith not Christ requires it not in order to this end, but simply and absolutely he requires it not. If this be not Antinomianism then *Islebius* himself hath been unjustly Charged with it. *Part.* 1. p. 213. &c.

3 As to the matter yet remaining Charged by Mr. *Br.* and others with Antinomianism, it may be reduced principally to four heads. 1 Justification as an Immanent Act in God; As actually Compleed in the redemption which is by Christ & in Christ; (both these before we beleeve:) 3 The absoluteness and irrespectiveness of it, freely without Conditions: 4 Christs satisfying for mans sinns against the Gospel as well as against the Law. Though I have spoken of all these enough, of each in its proper

place

place within this Tractate, yet ſomewhat for the fuller Clearing of my meaning may be ſaid here alſo. The firſt and ſecond I ſhall for brevity join in one as of no ſmall Cognation. As farr as I hold and have declared my ſelf to hold them; 1 I have alſo manifeſted in due place, how they are or ſeem at leaſt to be grounded upon the Scriptures; 2. They are expreſly and boldly aſſerted by many of the moſt Conſpicuous Divines in piety and Learning, that any of the Proteſtant Churches have enjoyed ever ſince the Reformation. 3. And that without the Contradiction or exception of any Church or Orthodox Writer for well nigh a hundred yeares, made againſt it: A great and probable Argument that it was the Common Judgement of all the Churches. 4. Mr. *Rhæterfordt* in his *Exercit. Apolog.* holds it forth not as the private opinion of ſome particular men, but as the Common Judgement of all the Churches. And the Remonſtrants take it as ſuch: For ſo I remember they oft argue in their *Apol.* and elſwhere, *Juſtificatio eſt purus putus Actus in Deo immanens* &c. not that they expreſs what *Arminius* his judgment and theirs after him is in this point: but that from this as a concluſion which they knew common to, and would not be denyed by any Proteſtant, their Argument would ſtand firm againſt them. Neither know I any one of the Proteſtants that hath written againſt them, excepting againſt it. 5 I never read any (to make me diſſent in judgement from theſe Worthies) that hath given his reaſons againſt it ſave Mr. *Br.* alone: and he handles the queſtion, like a man *ſpoyled with Philoſophy and vain deceit* (as the Apoſtle termeth the uſe of exotick learning in purely Goſpel matters) *after the traditions of men and Rudiments of the world, not after Chriſt*; Col. 2. 8. And his nakedneſs in ſuch his arguing is enough diſcovered by a learned Writer whoſe worth I ſhall ſtill honour, but have not ſo much as an Ambition ever to match. * He tells us indeed that Dr. Dunn-

* Mr. Kendal.

ham

ham hath written againſt it as delivered by Mr. *Pemble*. But I could not get the book to ſee his reaſons, nor know I any thing which he hath written but as I have heard from others. Beſides I have been told that ſome of the late Reverend Synod, diſreliſhed the doctrine, but cannot finde that any one of them hath publiſhed his reaſons for ſuch a diſreliſh. And Charity will not permit me to harbour the lighteſt imagination that any of thoſe grave Divines culld and ſelected out of the whole Nation for their eminency in godlineſs and learning, ſhould without any means uſed for information and conviction, exerciſe a Tyranny over the Conſciences of their leſſer brethren to force them into an implicit Faith to beleeve as themſelves beleeve: ſpecially when doing it they ſhall put out that which they think at leaſt to be the light of the word in their conſcience, and in conſenting with them without hearing a reaſon, they ſhall diſſent from others (whom their Modeſty will confeſs to be of no leſs deſervings in the Church) who have given their reaſons.

Yet ſtill I hold, 1 that thoſe Scriptures which treat of Juſtification by Faith do all relate to the tranſient juſtification which no man partakes of till he beleeveth. 2 That no man is perſonally juſtified, but onely in Chriſt the publike perſon, till he be by Faith united to Chriſt. That righteouſneſs and life ſo diſcend to us from the ſecond *Adam*, as ſinn and condemnation from the firſt. *As by the offence of one judgement came upon all to condemnation: ſo by the Righteouſneſs of one* the free gift *came upon all to Juſtification of life*, Rom. 5.18, 19. In *Adam* the publike perſon we were all repreſented, he was all, and we all conſidered in him, God ſaw us in all our individuall perſons in him, though we through *Adam* ſaw it not: ſo that *Adam* ſinning we all ſinned in him and became dead in law and guilty of condemnation before God, as if we had been then being and actually ſinning. Nevertheleſs as to our

ſelves we were not perſonally ſinners and guilty, untill we had a perſonall being in and from *Adam*. So in Chriſt ſatisfying Gods juſtce for ſinn, the Elect were all repreſented as in a publike perſon, ſatisfying in him & by him, and ſo all in him and by him juſtified and abſolved in all their individualls from ſinn and condemnation before God: Nevertheleſs we are not perſonally ſo juſtified, untill we have a perſonall being and new being in Chriſt and from Chriſt. 3. That this Tranſient Juſtification is a juſtifying or being juſtified before God paſſed at Gods Tribunall ſet up in mans Conſcience, from which he pronounceth abſolution to a poore ſinner denying himſelf and reſting upon Chriſt alone for Mercy. So that now, and never untill now he hath boldneſs to pierce by Faith into the Holieſt, and plead his righteouſneſs before him that ſitteth on the Mercy-ſeat. Thus our juſtification which was before in God and in Chriſt, is not at all derogatory to the juſtification which is by Faith: but onely prevents that this latter may not be derogatory to the praiſe of Gods Grace and Chriſts merits, which have completed all without our ſubſerviency for us: and thus God is all, ſeen to be all, and our boaſting excluded. This hitherto is my judgement untill I ſhall be better inſtructed —— *Tu ſi quid noviſti rectius iſtis, Candidus imperti.*

And at length if it ſhall be granted to be an error, yet it cannot be Antinomiſm, being a deviation not from the doctrine of the Law but of the Goſpel. It was not the judgement but malice of Mr. *Br* that gave it this brand of ignominy.

3 To the free abſolute and unconditionall Juſtification, I need not to Apologize for my ſelf at all. It is to the truly pious of the Miniſtery to whom my words are directed, who (among other) have given this evidence of your godlineſſe, that ye have not *forſaken your firſt Faith* by declining to Popery or Arminianiſm, what others judge

judge of me is *to me a small thing* (saith the Apostle of such) I weigh it not. But ye no doubt teach that the very promulgation of Justification runs upon no other condition but Faith alone, and upon Faith, not as a quality or vertue, but instrumentall to apply the righteousnesse of Christ to Justification, that works and the universall conditionall Justificatiou which Mr. *Br.* hath learned of his Masters, are to be excluded. In this yonr doctrine is one and the same in sense and substance with theirs that affirm Justification to be unconditionall. And it is indifferent to me to deliver the same truth in their words or yours: Onely I find that they make use of both the former and this Conclusion, as strong Fortresses against Popery and Arminianism, which causeth Mr. Br. with so much impetuousnesse and impotency to use his Mounts and Mines against them. Neither can I see any ground of objecting that either of these two doctrines can in any respect dull the affections to good works, sith it is confessed that they have no co-officiating with Faith to Justification.

4 To Christs satisfying for sins against the Gospel as wel as against the Law, I doubt not but ye see both the nicity and falsity of Mr. *Brs* Negation thereof. The chief Doctrines of the Gospel are Grace and Gratitude, Justification aud Sanctification. If Christ hath not satisfied for our long unbelief and contempt of the word of Faith before we beleeve, and of the infirmities of our Sanctification and Thankfulnesse when we have beleeved; or that there are sins against the New which are not sins against the Old Testament also; or that the Lord Jesus is not the Mediator of the New Testament but of the Old onely; or that in any of these it should be Antinomianism to dissent from Mr. *Br*: These all are so grosse Paradoxes that your gravity and wisdom cannot without Nauseousnesse smell them: plainly enough declaring indeed that what-

ſelves we were not perſonally ſinners and guilty, untill we had a perſonall being in and from *Adam*. So in Chriſt ſatisfying Gods juſtce for ſinn, the Elect were all repreſented as in a publike perſon, ſatisfying in him & by him, and ſo all in him and by him juſtified and abſolved in all their individualls from ſinn and condemnation before God: Nevertheleſs we are not perſonally ſo juſtified, untill we have a perſonall being and new being in Chriſt and from Chriſt. 3. That this Tranſient Juſtification is a juſtifying or being juſtified before God paſſed at Gods Tribunall ſet up in mans Conſcience, from which he pronounceth abſolution to a poore ſinner denying himſelf and reſting upon Chriſt alone for Mercy. So that now, and never untill now he hath boldneſs to pierce by Faith into the Holieſt, and plead his righteouſneſs before him that ſitteth on the Mercy-ſeat. Thus our juſtification which was before in God and in Chriſt, is not at all derogatory to the juſtification which is by Faith: but onely prevents that this latter may not be derogatory to the praiſe of Gods Grace and Chriſts merits, which have completed all without our ſubſerviency for us: and thus God is all, ſeen to be all, and our boaſting excluded. This hitherto is my judgement untill I ſhall be better inſtructed —— *Tu ſi quid noviſti rectius iſtis, Candidus imperti.*

And at length if it ſhall be granted to be an error, yet it cannot be Antinomiſm, being a deviation not from the doctrine of the Law but of the Goſpel. It was not the judgement but malice of Mr. *Er* that gave it this brand of ignominy.

3 To the free abſolute and unconditionall Juſtification, I need not to Apologize for my ſelf at all. It is to the truly pious of the Miniſtery to whom my words are directed, who (among other) have given this evidence of your godlineſſe, that ye have not *forſaken your firſt Faith* by declining to Popery or Arminianiſm, what others judge

judge of me is *to me a ſmall thing* (ſaith the Apoſtle of ſuch) I weigh it not. But ye no doubt teach that the very promulgation of Juſtification runs upon no other condition but Faith alone, and upon Faith, not as a quality or vertue, but inſtrumentall to apply the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt to Juſtification, that works and the univerſall conditionall Juſtificatiou which Mr. *Br.* hath learned of his Maſters, are to be excluded. In this yonr doctrine is one and the ſame in ſenſe and ſubſtance with theirs that affirm Juſtification to be unconditionall. And it is indifferent to me to deliver the ſame truth in their words or yours: Onely I find that they make uſe of both the former and this Concluſion, as ſtrong Fortreſſes againſt Popery and Arminianiſm, which cauſeth Mr. Br. with ſo much impetuouſneſſe and impotency to uſe his Mounts and Mines againſt them. Neither can I ſee any ground of objecting that either of theſe two doctrines can in any reſpect dull the affections to good works, ſith it is confeſſed that they have no co-officiating with Faith to Juſtificatioa.

4 To Chriſts ſatisfying for ſins againſt the Goſpel as wel as againſt the Law, I doubt not but ye ſee both the nicity and falſity of Mr. *Brs* Negation thereof. The chief Doctrines of the Goſpel are Grace and Gratitude, Juſtification aud Sanctification. If Chriſt hath not ſatisfied for our long unbelief and contempt of the word of Faith before we beleeve, and of the infirmities of our Sanctification and Thankfulneſſ when we have beleeved; or that there are ſins againſt the New which are not ſins againſt the Old Teſtament alſo; or that the Lord Jeſus is not the Mediator of the New Teſtament but of the Old onely; or that in any of theſe it ſhould be Antinomianiſm to diſſent from Mr. *Br*: Theſe all are ſo groſſe Paradoxes that your gravity and wiſedom cannot without Nauſeouſneſſ ſmell them: plainly enough declaring indeed that whatſoever

ſoever ſtandeth in his way of Babel building he will curſe it (though never ſo ſacred) and fright them that are as feeble as fearfull, with his ſcar-crow of Antinomianiſm, though he make himſelf never ſo ridiculous thereby to the intelligent and prudent.

I have no more to ſay upon this ſubject, and what I have ſaid hath been before him that being omniſcient knoweth that I have ſpoken ſingly the whole truth, and nothing but the Truth. Neither can all the ſtrength of my jealouſy ſuſpect any leaſt or greateſt thing beſides theſe wherewith either Mr. *Br.* or any of his Diſciples can charge me as with Antinomianiſm, ſo that I do with ſome confident boldneſſe appeal to your judgment whether I deſerve from them this imputation. Inded ſuch ſoul-reviving comforts have flown in upon me from the Grace of God in Chriſt, that out of the abundance of the heart the mouth will ſpeak, and I can ſcarce Preach any other thing then Chriſt and him Crucified; yet in holding forth a wounded, I hold not forth a maimed Chriſt to the people, but Chriſt with all his benefits, in particular to Sanctification no leſſe then to Juſtification. If it be Antinomianiſm ſo to reduce all to Chriſt, and derive all from him, I muſt undergo the worlds condemnation for Chriſts ſake that hath juſtified and will at length receive me.

One thing more I have to add, and I ſhall be no further tedious. It may be a Charge againſt me that I am too plain, broad and unſparing in my words againſt Mr. *Tr.* throughout this Tractate. That which I have to ſay for my ſelf is,

1 That it ariſeth not ſo much from my own temper, as from the occaſion thereof given by Mr. *Br.* I am ready for Chriſts ſake to become the foot ſtool of the meek, but where I find a ſelf-exalting, I cannot cry *Abreeh*. When I ſee Mr. *Br.* uſurping the Chair to paſſe ſentence and cenſure upon all the Divines that have written, theſe are learned,

ned, thoſe unſtudied Divines, to exalt and degrade better men than himſelf as they are more either concurrent with or abhorrent from his *Bellarmin* and *Arminius:* I cannot, I dare not uſe words that might ſtrengthen but rather vilifie the ſelf confidence and arrogance of the man. So when the Wolf comes in ſheeps clothing to devour, when under the profeſſion of a Proteſtant and Preſbyterian Divine, he vends his Popiſh and Arminian under the name of Proteſtant Tenets, diſſembling his confederacy with the enemies thereof,

Si natura negat facit indignatio verſum.

The view of ſuch hypocriſy is enough to make a ſheep a Satyriſt. Had I been to deal with a Papiſt or Arminian, that had diſcovered themſelves unmasked, I ſhould have ſpoken in another Dialect.

2 It ſprang from other mens yea Miniſters too much admiration and almoſt adoration of him, when from all parts there was ſuch Concurſe in a way of Pilgrimage to him, to bleſſe him or be bleſſ'd by him, and the admirers returned to the deceiving of others, with no leſſe applauſ and triumph, than the Turks from viſiting the ſhrine of their *Mahomet* at *Mecha*; It was requiſite to diſcover whether he were a God or an Idol to whom ſuch honour was preſented.

3 I have herein Chriſt and his Apoſtles my leaders, from whom though we ſeldome heare a courſe word againſt any other ſort of men, yea of ſinners, yet when they ſpeak againſt Impoſtors and Heretikes, ſpecially ſuch as bring their own works and righteouſneſſe to Juſtification, they ſo ſpeak as if they were made up of bitterneſſe and invectives. *Ye hypocrites, ſowred with the leaven, and whoſe doctrine is the doctrine of hypocriſy,* Mat. 16. 3. 6. 12. *Ye Serpents, a Generation of Vipers, how can ye eſcape the judgment of Hell,* Mat. 23. 33. *Wo unto you, wo unto you Scribes and Phariſees, hypocrites, for ye ſhut up the Kingdom of*

God

God againſt men, ye neither go in your ſelves, nor ſuffer them that would to enter, &c. Mat. 23. 14, 15, *&c. Children of hell, blind guides, fools and blind, whited Sepulchres,* ver. 15, 16, 17, 27. *The Publicans are juſtified rather then you, enter into the Kingdome before you,* Lu. 18. 14. Ma. 21. 31. *More joy is in Heaven for one ſinner repenting, than 99 ſuch,* &c. Lu. 15. 7. *Falſe brethren,* Gal. 2. 4. *Subverters of ſouls,* Acts 15. 24. *Grievous Wolves, not ſparing the flocke,* Acts 20. 29. *Falſe Apoſtles, deceitfull workers, transforming themſelves into the Apoſtles of Chriſt, Satans Miniſters transformed into Miniſters of Righteouſneſs, as Satan transformed himſelf into an Angel of light,* 2 Cor. 11. 13, 14, 15. *Doggs, evil workers, the Conciſion,* Phil. 3. 2. *Let them be accurſed,* Gal. 1. 8. *I would they were cut off,* Gal. 5. 12. with many other the like paſſages. It ſavours not of the ſpirit and zeal of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, not to ſpeak home to this kind of men above the reſt. But if I have not fully proved Mr: *Brs* principles and doctrines to be the ſame in ſubſtance with theſe falſe Apoſtles, as elſwhere in this Treatiſe, ſo ſpecially *Part* 2. *Chap* 19. I acknowledge my ſelf not to underſtand either Saint *Paul* or Mr. *Br.*

My Requeſt now ſhall be ſuch as hath equity in it, that as far as ye find this Tractate Orthodox and Conſonant to ſound Doctrine, ye will be pleaſed to grant it and the Author of it your Patronage, and prayers for a bleſſing upon it, and where ye ſee it otherwiſe, to vouchſafe to its Author your Admonition, not ſuffering him to ſtray, whom charity binds you to reduce into the way. This is deſired as from all ſo from every of you, by

From my Lodging in *Alderſgate*-ſtreet, *Decemb.* 24. 1653.

YOUR

Humbly devoted Servant

in the Lord Jeſus.

JOHN CRANDON.

To the truly Vertuous and Religious Lady, *Margaret Hildesley* of *Hinton*, in the County of *South-Hampton*, the Author wisheth all Grace and perfections in the LORD JESUS.

Madam,

IT abides (*I know*) *in fresh remembrance with you, by whom, and with what transcendent praises both of the Worke & its Author the Aphorisms in this ensuing Tractate examined, were commended to your perusall, to be an* Enchiridion *or Manual still in your hand, or rather a Pectorall and Antidote next, your heart to defend it against errors and inward Anguish. But so abundantly hath God enriched you with the knowledg of, and zeale for that pretious Misiery of Christ, that you quickly saw the Misterie of iniquity that lurked in it, therefore cast it aside as unprofitable, yea noxious. Yet afterward finding some of the Ministers with whom you had acquaintance, deceived by it, you intreated me to take it, and give you my judgment of the worke, and my exceptions against some Mistakes in it. And as the deceit was further propagated, so you urged me to increase my exceptions, and now at length that which was not purposed at first is come forth to publique view, an Answer to Mr.* Brs *Aphorisms. Alas that wee are brought forth in such an Age, wherein the defence of Christs cause is left to fools and carkasses of men, the Learned and potent declining the service; that in the midst of our Civill, or rather uncivil broyls one against another, there should be found such as fall foule with the Grace of God and Merits of Christ also: that to preach the Gospel of Christ purely, after the example and precepts of* Paul *and* Luther *should render a man in the opinion of so many, an Heretick; but to follow* Arminius *and* Bellarmine, *gets applause: that we are forced to see men* violent *and using* force *to subvert, not to* enter into the Kingdom of Christ. *If this Treatise shall by the assistance of Gods mercy, be in any degree helpfull to cure this Malady, they that finde or see the benefit, are bound to praise God for you, that by*

you.

you as a speciall instrument instigating, it came to see the Light. Whatsoever weakness there is in it, will redound to the shame of the Author, not at all reflect upon you, whose desire it was (could you have attained it) to have had the best Patron employed in the defence of the best Cause.

I expect that Mr. Br. *will come forth, and that speedily with a vehement Reply. But whatsoever he saith, I shall follow the precept of the Apostle,* Tit. 3. 10, 11. *He hath had a first, and two hundred of Admonitions (as they report which come from him) which he laies as heaps of sand, not answering any of them, how should I follow the Apostles precept in not rejecting, in having any thing more to do with him. The present Worke had no other relation to him, but as to the undeceiving of the simple which had received infection from him. But if my beloved and Reverend Brother in the work of the Lord, which commended to you Mr.* Br's *Aphorisms, and hath made it long his work to propagate it through many Counties, yea undertaken in the Western Counties to be the defender of all that Mr.* Br *hath written in that Book (the performance wherof is by many Ministers there expected) will take it up as his task to Apologize for him, and affirm the Apology (as in his name) so to be his owne; I shall in despight of all infirmities of mind and body, so long as breath lasteth, by Gods assistance Anti-apologize for Christ, and that not in such an expression of words as I have used to M.* Br *(whom I look upon as an Impostor) but in such a spirit of meekness and Reverence, as is meet to be used towards so pious and learned a Divine, who cannot, dares not against the light of his conscience hold any Truth of God in unrighteousness.*

The Lord give unto you to keep your station firm in the Light and heat of the Sun of Righteousness, that the splendor thereof may more and more shine into your understanding, and the heat thereof more inflame your affections to the pure Gospel of Christ, that you may be able to comprehend with all Saints what is the breadth *and* length *and* depth *and* height: *And to know the love of Christ, which surpasseth all knowledg, and be filled with all the fulness of God. This is the request of*

MADAM

From my Lodging, Decemb. 24. 1653.

Your humble servant and daily Remembrancer at the throne of Grace, J: C:

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

Courteous Reader,

IF thou knoweſt me as well as I know my ſelfe, thou wilt alſo wonder as much as my ſelf, to ſee me appeare in Print, ſpecially in ſo Momentous a Cauſe, and that againſt ſo formidable an Antagoniſt. But the ground of our wondering may ſomewhat differ. That which affects thee may be, that a man of ſo deſpicable parts ſhould dare to brandiſh a weapon (though the Lords) againſt ſo great & incomparable a Champion, as fleſh and blood accounts him. But the thing which affects me is, that the Heroick Worthies of our Land hide their heads, and *Come not forth to helpe the Lord againſt the mighty*, Jud. 5. 23, but leave the defence of Chriſts cauſe to contemptible and unqualified perſons for ſuch a performance. In excuſe of my ſelfe againſt the imputation of raſhneſſe and preſumption, I can ſay, Mr. *Baxters* Aphoriſms had been extant full three yeares, before I put pen to paper to except againſt him. A ſtrong expectation ſtill poſſeſſed me of ſeeing ſomething come forth againſt him from an abler hand. When my expectation failed, and I found his Tractate of all other that have come forth theſe many yeares, moſt perillous, and pernicious, as deſtroying the very foundation of a Chriſtians hope and

comfort, at length I thought it fit to do my endeavour for the undeceiving of ſome private Friends either taken, or in danger to be taken in his ſnares, not ceaſing ſtill to expect the publication of ſome work by others, openly to vindicate the grace of God from his injurious warring againſt it. At length, having finiſhed what I thought fit to be communicated privately to ſome friends, and not with-holding the view thereof from any that craved it; I ſuffered it to ſleep many moneths, in hope ſtill to ſee a more learned anſwer to his worke. What ſhould I do more? May not I juſtly ſay with *David*, when all the armed Worthies of Iſrael either fled, or at leaſt ſhunned the encounter, was *there not a cauſe to ſtand forth* (for lack of better weapons) *with a ſling and a ſmooth ſtone*, truſting in the name of the God of *Iſrael*, *whoſe grace this man had defied?* When the wiſe and prudent, the high Prieſts, Scribes and Phariſees oppugned the grace of God in giving Chriſt to be the juſtifier of Publicans, Harlots, and Sinners, the ſpirit of Chriſt enlarged the hearts of the illiterate and vulgar *to ſing their Hoſannahs*, *and out of the mouths of babes and ſucklings ordained praiſe* to himſelfe: Nay, *if theſe ſhould hold their peace*, *the very ſtones ſhould cry out*, ſaith our Saviour. When the caſe is like it at preſent, and the *Angelici Doctores* are ſilent, it is the fit ſeaſon for Chriſt to animate the very *Terræ filios*, to ſpeak in the defence of his grace. I held my ſelfe the unfitteſt of many (if not of all) to come upon this ſtage; yet not ſo unfit, but if none elſe would, I tooke my ſelf obliged to aſcend it. Yea ſuch is the power of *Truth*, this *Truth of Truths*, this great and cardinall truth here controverted, that I feare not by the word, and in the Spirit of the Lord Jeſus, to enter the Liſts with all men and Devills that ſhall oppugn it; ſo vain a ſhadow is all the wiſdome and ſophiſtry of men, and depths of Satan, when oppoſed to the Goſpel of Chriſt which is the power and wiſdome of God.

It will next be objected, that this Tractate of mine comes forth into publique view more raw, rugged, incompendious, and unpoliſhed, than befits the Majeſtie of the Doctrine whereof it treateth. I doe not, I cannot deny it. I ſaw what ſhould have been done more, but was not in a capacity to do it. That which I can ſay for my ſelf is, 1. That it was written for private uſe, without any purpoſe to make it common, untill I came to the latter part, and almoſt the end of it. 2. My acquaintance knoweth how many, and how long interruptions of ſickneſſe I had in the writing thereof, that I was but *Canis ad Nilum*, did all by ſnatches, which much

much hindered the right compoſure of the whole, and connexion of its parts. 3. I could not find one man about us that *vel prece vel pretio*, was fit and willing to tranſcribe one Copie thereof, neither was in ſtrength of body to do it my ſelfe: So that what was firſt done, in the ſame *Craſſo filo* in which it was firſt done, without any abreviations, alterations, or poliſhings, is now preſented to the Printer to be made uſe of: My judgment telling me that rather a courſe piece, then nothing at all ſhould appear againſt Mr. *Baxter*, at leaſt to invite others that excell in abilities of minde and body, to come after with a more exact Treatiſe. If all this excuſe not, and that the *Velle* be no fit Apology to take off the crime of *Non Poſſe*, I am contented to lie under Cenſure: yet with this comfort, that the leſſe of man, the more of God is to be found in theſe fruits of my Labours; All that is therein being grounded upon the ſure word of God, whoſe plainneſs hath more excellency in it then all mans accurateneſſe.

It remains, that before I diſcend to give my particular exceptions againſt the Doctrine of this Tractate of Mr. *Baxter*, ſomething be premiſed. 1. Of the Author, 2. Of the worke in generall, 3. Of my intention in excepting againſt it. The miſtake of the two former more deluding ſome unwary perſons (as I have obſerved) then all his arguments of themſelves could do. 1. Then of the Author.

I can ſpeak nothing of him from my owne acquaintance with him. For, *Albus an ater, homo ſit neſcio*, I was never ſo happy or unhappy to ſee his face, therefore muſt ſpeak of him partly as he hath been repreſented and deſcribed by others, partly as he makes out himſelf.

1. Touching his learning, as he hath been magnified by others, ſuch he manifeſteth himſelfe. He that ſhall peruſe this one Tractate of his, muſt be forced to cry out, *Quantus, quantus, nil niſi ſapientia eſt*, a deep and meer Philoſopher (I ſay not Philoſophaſter) yea *Grammaticus Rhetor Geometres*, &c. In all partt of humane learning a *Cathedrall Doctor*: But his Maſter-piece is *Sophiſtry*, in this way of the worlds ſublimated Divinity; he is not behind the Angelicall and Seraphicall Doctors, *Thomas* and *Scotus*, and their followers. As for that lower and meaner region of Learning, viz. Scripture, and more ſpecially Goſpel-knowledg, himſelfe tells us that his *ſtanding and underſtanding* is mounted above that mentioned, *Job* 8. 9. That for lack of other work, and through the defect or abſence

Append. *pag.* 110, 111. of better Books, he once read the Scripture ſix dayes together, in which time he ſuckt much more out of the Word, then ever God breathed into it, which he confeſſeth he could not have done of himſelfe, without the help of other Books which he had formerly read, *i. e.* without the gloſſes of the Schoolmen and Jeſuites, which know ſo much of Chriſt, as their Maſter *Ariſtotle* could teach them. And that this man underſtands the Scriptures no leſſe compleatly than the worſt of them in a Catholique ſenſe, we ſhall finde I doubt not, when we come to examine the Texts which he brings to prove his Catholique Juſtification.

2. As for his piety, ſtrictneſſe, mortification, holineſſe, zeal, &c. in reſpect whereof ſome have even canoniz'd him for a matchleſſe and ſuper-eminent Saint (as I have underſtood by many in the Weſtern parts, before I ever ſaw any of his works) I ſhould ſay enough in ſaying over what Dr. *Twiſſ.* hath written in his Anſwer to the Preface and Prefacer unto *Arminius* his *Anti-perkinſinianiſm*, where the *Prefacer* in the ſame manner exalteth the parts and vertues of *Arminius*, thereby to make way into the hearts of men to receive his Doctrine. The Dr. acquitting himſelfe firſt of any diſlike that he hath of the piety of children in advancing their Fathers praiſe, and affirming his deſire herein to proceed no further then to lay downe a caution, that the truth may receive no damage by the ſuperlative praiſe of any man; anſwers, That although there might be oppoſed againſt *Arminius* that diſſent from him in judgment, even the whole cloud of Proteſtant Divines, the very lights of the Church, that in parts and vertues were no way behind *Arminius*, if not his ſuperiours; yet he will not do it, becauſe neither hath God commanded, nor is it ſafe for us to make the ſplendor of mens perſons, but the infallible word of the moſt High, our rule to judge of Doctrines, and try the opinions of men.

But I adde ſecondly, That it hath been uſuall to Satan in all ages to employ whited Sepulchers, beautifull without, to broach and defend Hereſies in the Church. He wants not his depths, is not ignorant that men of vitious lives are unfit to deceive and pervert conſciences. Therefore when himſelfe will deceive, he puts off his Devils face, and *transforms himſelfe into an Angell of Light: No marvaile then if ſo doe alſo his Miniſters*, when they are about to ſeduce, *to transforme themſelves into Apoſtles of Chriſt, and Miniſters of Righteouſneſſe*, 2 Cor. 11. 13.---15. Where hath there ever been more appearance of holineſſe (and men cannot ſearch the heart) then in the

the *Scribes and Phariſees?* Then in the *Monks vnd Fryers?* then among the *Socinians*, yea among the very *Turkes?* Shall then the outward varniſh of their ſeeming vertues, beſool us to drink downe their damning doctrines?

3 Though *Paul or an Angel from Heaven preach unto you another Goſpel, let him be accurſed*, Gal. 1. 8. ſaith the Holy Ghoſt; but whether Mr *Baxter* doth in this Treatiſe bring us another Goſpel, his Doctrine in the Examination thereof will manifeſt.

4 I would that this his Treatiſe did ſpeak him out to be ſo ſtrictly and tenderly conſcientious as his friends proclaim him; I ſhould then either in perſon have made recourſe to him, to communicate my thoughts to him, or written in another tone, in the ſpirit of meekneſſe to him, to have received fuller ſatisfaction from him, if my impotency could not have miniſtred ſome information to him. But we ſhall find in what he writes, many things that may work in us a jealouſie of the ſincerity of a ſanctified Conſcience in him. I ſhall here mention ſome generals, leaving the reſt untill we come to except againſt the particulars.

One thing that occaſioneth this jealouſie, is the want of ingenuity, truth and ſimplicity in his Aſſertions. For one inſtance hereof we need not ſtep further then to the title of the work, where he affirms it to be publiſhed eſpecially for the uſe of the Church of *Kederminſter* in *Worceſterſhire*. Can any man that hath but glanced an eye on the ſurface of humane literature, think him to mean as he ſpeaketh? Either we muſt conclude that he hath the very ſpirit of all Philoſophicall and Metaphyſicall learning, which he breaths forth as effectually upon his Diſciples, as *Knipperdoling* did the Holy Ghoſt upon his *Anabaptiſts*; or elſe his Church for the greateſt number of its members is not in a capacity of underſtanding him. That his Church by his preſidency in it, is on a ſudden become *a Najoth in Ramah*, every *Saul* that comes neer it doth *philoſophari*, if not *prophetare*, ſo that *ex ejus Ludo tanquam ex equo Trojano innumeri principes exiêre* (*Pauls* Princes, I mean Princes in ſecular wiſedome and learning, 1 *Cor.* 2. 6. 8.) elſe if his people have no ſuch inſpiration above other Churches, ſurely the moſt of them ſtagger at the firſt word in the title of the Book, underſtand not the tenth part of his ſacred ſubtle diſtinctions, but in moſt things that he ſaith he is to them a *Barbarian*, and they to him. Nay Mr *Baxter* is not a novice, he knowes where and for what mouths to chew his morſels, and to whom to give them to be chewed. It was eſpecially for the nimble

nimble wits and logicall Teachers of the Churches, that this broth was boyled (as I shall shew more fully afterward) that having misled the leaders, he might by them mislead their flocks also. 2 And as little ingenuity and truth is there in him, where he quoteth some whom he (against his stomach) cals Orthodox Divines, and from some locutions and fragments of their sentences, concludes them to be of his Judgement; when he knowes their Doctrine about Justification, to be so diametrically opposite to his, as hell to heaven, and Antichrist to Christ: so that if they be Orthodox, himselfe must needs be Hetorodox. This he well knowes, but his ingenuity and single-heartednes hides it, and pretends the contrary. 3 Is not his face Ferry-man-like one way, and his motion another, when the whole tenor of what he writes is not to set up any new opinion, but to erect again, and put life into that cursed Heresie of the Papists, Justification by Works; yet to hide his purpose from them that see not, or will not see, he sometimes *solemnly professeth before God, that it is no affectation of singularity that drew him to this Judgement; at other times falls foul with the Papists*, telling us that *no advantage is to be given to the Papists in this Doctrine of Justification*, when himselfe all the while is ploughing their field, and strengthening their hands to the offence of all the truly wise and godly: what hypocrisie, semibling and dissembling is this? Why doth he acquit himselfe of that which no man chargeth upon him? What understanding Reader of him can harbour one thought of his bending to singularity? It is plain to every eye that is open, that he walks not solitary, but hath thronged himselfe into the communion of the Holy Mother Church, and fellowship of all her Saint Popish Schoolmen, Monks, Fryers, and Jesuites. That his study is to lay an odium implicitely and in the dark upon us, I mean not onely all the Orthodox Divines, but also all the Reformed Churches that have been, or now are, that they are all guilty of singularity, seperation and Apostacy, in departing from the Romish Synagogue in the Doctrine of Justification; therefore hath he spread his nets to catch as many as he can, to carry them back into *Babylon* againe. Let Mr *Baxter* have (as he hath) a confident and swelling opinion of his owne abilities, but let him not so abuse all others, as if Star-like their light must be totally dazled at the approach of his supposed sun-beams. Wretched *England*, if all her Seers are become blind, and none can discern Christ from Antichrist, even in his mystery. Nay let him know that there are many which see and detest

deteſt what he hath written, no leſſe then if it had been ſent by the Popes own Legate, to beguile. Ingenuity, truth, and ſincerity would have acted another way. Mr *Baxter* if he had been ſeaſoned therewith, would have plainly acknowledged, that he had examined the Controverſie between us and the Papiſts, about Juſtification; that as far as his comprehenſion can reach, he finds them in the truth, and us erroneous: and then ſhould have alledged the Scriptures and other Arguments which they produce for the eſtabliſhing of their Tenents, and the Exceptions which in the Reformed Churches have been made againſt ſuch Arguments; and ſhewed the invalidity of thoſe Exceptions, in no wiſe anſwering or weakning the Popiſh Reaſons, by means whereof his judgement and conſcience force him to ſide with them, and not with us. Thus candour and conſcience would have wrought upon him; for he cannot deny, but that both he cloſeth with them in the ſame concluſions, and that all the Scriptures, Arguments and diſtinctions (ſcarce any excepted) which he brings for the promoting of ſuch Concluſions, are taken from the Papiſts, and have been anſwered over and over a hundred times, by our Divines. Therefore to ſet forth his Aſſertions as new, and to annex his Reaſons for the confirmation thereof, as now firſt heard of, argues intolerable impudency in his daubing and diſſembling. To have dealt thus candidly and conſcientiouſly, would have excited many learned and holy men to a lovely conference with him, which now contemn him as a ſeducer, and ſeduced; but if this had been done, where ſhould the crooked *Serpent, and working of Satan, and Deceivablenaſſe of unrighteouſneſſe*, which ſtill accompany that *Man of ſin, and thoſe that beare his marke*, have appeared? 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 9, 10.

4 And his doubleneſſe and liegerdemain is no leſſe exerciſed, in that thorow-out his Treatiſe, he is ever and anon ſparkling his fire-brands againſt the *Antinomians*, thereby ſecretly inſtilling into his unwary Readers, that it is againſt them this his work mainly levelleth; when contrariwiſe under this name and mask, his War is againſt all the Orthodox Churches and Divines that are or have been ſince the Reformation.

Theſe all with him are *Antinomians*, as himſelfe ſometimes when they ſtand in his way and ſtirr his paſſion, doth ſomewhat inconſiderately ſpeak out, telling us that he meanes that *Antinomianiſm*, whereof Dr. *Twiſſ* and Mr. *Pemble* bear up the pillars, *pag.* 73. and conſequently whereof *Luther*, *Calvin*, and the reſt Divines and Martyrs

tyrs employ'd in the Reformation have re-edified the walls, yea *Paul* and Chriſt himſelf have laid the foundation. But this craft he learn'd (as the reſt) from his Maſters the Monks and Jeſuits, who when they ſet themſelves to batter the truth of Chriſt, cry out in their Pulpits and Writings againſt the *Huguenots*, *Lutherans*, *Hereticks*, laying ſuch ſlanders on the truth and them which teach or hold it, that they may ſtirr an Odium in the people, among whom there are ſome ſo ignorant, that dwelling at a diſtance from the Proteſtants, and having never ſeen any of them, they think them not to be men (having heard ſo much evill of them) but ſome Monſters and Devils flown lately out of the bottomles pit, to trouble and deceive the world. Therefore are filled with ſuch prejudice againſt their Doctrine, that if they were told theſe Hereticks ſay Chriſt is the Son of God and Saviour of the world, they would (in hatred of the ſuppoſed Hereticks) be ready to reject both Chriſt and ſalvation, leſt they ſhould ſeem to hold with them. Mr. *Baxter* needs not the incitation of any ſpurr to follow, having ſuch Leaders, and the opportunity alſo ſerved to his ends. He hath taken full notice, that in theſe laſt yeares among the greateſt, *i. e.* the vulgar part of our Miniſters, the name of *Antinomianiſm* hath been the worſt abhomination, and that they have ſo inveigled their credulous congregations with the feare and hatred of it, that any Phariſaicall, Monkiſh, or Jeſuiticall ſpirits, that would but cry aloud and lift up their voyce againſt *Antinomians*, found welcome not only to their perſons, but to the whole galley-maufry of formalities, moralities, wood, hay, and ſtubble that they ſcattered among the people. When contrariwiſe, if any ſhould but often name Chriſt and Grace in his Sermon, all were ſhie of him, turned their heels in ſtead of their faces towards him and his Doctrine, though never ſo pretious and wholſome, fearing ſome tincture therein of *Antinomianiſm*. This advantage therefore hath hee taken to batter the Doctrine of the Goſpel, under the name of *Antinomiſm*, knowing that if Chriſt himſelf ſhould again deſcend from heaven to preach it in his own perſon, he ſhould under this vizard, finde contempt of himſelf and his Doctrine among the vulgar. I acknowledg every divine truth to be ſo ſacred and pretious, that we ought to defend and redeem it from oppreſſion with our very blood. Whatſoever therefore of errours againſt the truth the *Antinomians* (truly ſo called) have broached, wee ought with all our ſtrength to reſiſt and reject. And hereof I ſhall have occaſion to

ſpeak

ſpeak more fully afterward. In the interim I may lay down fairly and truly theſe two aſſertions.

1. That Mr. *Baxters* principall aime is by this odious term to fright weak and inconſiderate perſons from the truth of Chriſt.

2. That all that catalogue of errors which *Sleidan* in his Commentaries aſcribeth to the *Antinomians* of *Germany* about 100. years ſithence; and all the tenents of thoſe that among us are or have bin *Antinomians* indeed (as farr as in my acquaintance with them I could ever gather from them) contein not a mole-hill in compariſon of that mountain of evill and miſchief, that by this Treatiſe Mr. *Baxter* would hurl upon us.

A ſecond thing which miniſters occaſion to us to doubt of this mans ſpirituall conſcientiouſneſſe, is his prophaning and vilifying of holy things. We find him oft in this proſtrating religion, conſcience, and the word of God it ſelfe, to the cenſure and ſentence of reaſon, yea of naturall and carnall reaſon: and that, thoſe very things which reaſon cannot comprehend, even *things which eye hath not ſeene, nor eare heard, neither hath it entred into the heart, but are revealed onely by the word and ſpirit*, 1 Cor. 2. 9, &c. Theſe are the myſteries of the Goſpel, Juſtification, Adoption, &c. when Mr. *Baxter* at ſome times cannot poſſibly evade ſuch Scriptures as diſcover his errours, with what vehemency doth he forth-with lay hold on them to ſacrifice them to ſenſe and reaſon, yea to that which is worſe then ſenſe and reaſon? *Flectere ſi nequeat ſuperos, Acheronta movebit*, when heaven is againſt him, he appeals to hell to ſpeak for him, ſummoning together not only the Jeſuites, but the very Ghoſts of the moſt curſed Hereticks by their authority to ſettle his conſcience, and ſubject the word to it. *Is not here wanting that trembling at Gods word*, which is required and found in the Saints? He doth rarely indeed mention the Authors whom he followeth as his Maſters, but that is of craft, that he might not caſt an Odium upon his Doctrine, he thinks it more fit to offer it as ſome ſacred thing ſpun out of his own brain, that there might be the leſſe ſuſpicion of it. But that it is drawn out of thoſe channels which I have mentioned, I ſhall be ready to ſhew in particulars, if any doubting ſhall demand it of me. Neither let it offend, that in groſs and courſe terms I ſpeak the truth of the Author. It is wholly againſt the bent of my diſpoſition ſo to do, were it not that it is the very foundation of all our hopes that is by him battered, and that the profuſe commendation which ſome have given of the man,

to draw Disciples to him, did not force me to speak unsparingly (while truly) to undeceive some of my friends, that through credulity either are or might be seduced.

Thus far of the man as he hath been represented by others, I shal say somethir g of him also as he renders himself to us by this Treatise. I cannot, I will not think him one that is wilfully apostatiz'd. But finding him a man of excellent both naturall and acquired parts, of a very rationall brain, delighted more in depths than in shallows, in the logicall deep and serious, than in the lighter, and superficiary parts of learning. I conceive him to have been carryed out by his own Genius to the reading of the deepest Scholastick writers, with the purpose that *Virgil* once applyed himself to the reading of *Ennius*, though not with the same successe. The purpose of both probably was to fetch out *è stercore gemmam*, a jewel out of the dunghill. But this man meeting with learning perfectly agreeing with his naturall Genius, became impotent to obtaine his purpose; for being delighted with the dunghil, he hath made it his sphere and element; the depth of rationality which he found in his Authors, hath drawn and captivated him to their most cursed opinions: so that we find him in stead of a Gemm, bringing forth a Cockatrice-egg, which if it be not destroyed in the shell, will ruine himself and many others. It is an infirmity that hath made impression in points lesse momentous, upon some persons of great note in the Church. I shall mention one *Hierom* in stead of the rest. In his works as they are set forth by *Erasmus*, *Tom.* 1. there is a Book intituled, *Catalogos Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*; in which *Hierom* mentioning *Tertullian*, and not being able to deny his falling into *Montanism*, he thus at least minceth his fault. *Invidia & contumeliis Clericorum Romanæ Ecclesiæ ad Montani dogma delapsus est* (saith he) *i. e.* through the envy and reproaches which he suffered from the Clergy of *Rome*, he declined to the opinion of *Montanus*. *Erasmus* in his Scholia upon these words thus writeth, *Ut favit Hieronimus ingenio Tertulliani*, &c. *i. e.* See how *Hierom* favoured *Tertullians* wit, almost excusing him for falling into the faction of the *Montanists*, laying the fault upon the envy and reproaches of the *Roman* Priests. So farr *Erasmus*. He might have further added [so farr he delighted in *Tertullians* wit, that he did not only excuse him, but also] was carried by the pleasing stream of his wit and learning, into the very dregs of *Montanism* as deep as *Tertullian* himself. So shall wee finde him discovering himself at the full, in his first Book against *Jovinian*,

nian, as *Erasmus* himself in his Antidote prefixed thereunto doth hint, but the work it self makes it notoriously plain. It contents not that good Monk Father, there to produce as his own, all *Tertullians* arguments, except he also delivers them for the most part in *Tertullians* very words, so that there were not wanting such as excepted against him as a very *Montanist*. I speak not to lessen the worth of those two ancient Writers, but to manifest in these two great and sublimated *Wits*, when the Genius of one man so conspireth with anothers, as to delight abundantly, it is as the Loadstone and iron to draw & to follow into falshood as well as truth, except there be interposed much of the spirit of grace and meeknes, and so high an esteem of the Word, that the mind explodes all other learning as base in comparison of it. No marvail then if Mr. *Baxter* having immixt himself into whole troops of Schoolmen, Jesuits, and others of the same Scholastick train with himself, hath been carried away in the crowd captive to their basest errors. Some would marvail rather how there should be found in *England* any Divines professing antipathy to *Rome*, applauding the very worst piece of *Romes* Heresies, as soon as Mr. *Baxter* hath breathed upon and blessed it. But the case is the same. Mr. *Baxter* well knew in what water to angle that he might catch, he perceived that the Doctrine of Justification for these fifty years hath been too little preached in *England*. That since the heat of controversie betwixt us and the Papists about it abated, this Doctrine sounded in few Pulpits, which before sounded in all, that the *Pia fraus* (as they termed it) prevailed every where, a godly deceit to with-hold from the people the knowledg of the libertie which they have by Christ, lest they should turn it into licentiousnesse. That as this pious fraud passed from hand to hand among the Ministers, many of them while they were deceiving, were themselves deceived, and verily thought it the right art of profitable preaching to hold out the Law, and keep in the Gospel, to *wash the utter part of the cup and platter, leaving that which is within full of guilt and corruption.* Hence it came to pass that the Law by many was turned to a two-fold use, like the sword of *Achilles* to *Telephus*, to wound first, and then to heale, to cast down and to erect again, to kill and make alive, to damn and then to save also. First, it was so brandished for conviction, that all men by the light and curse thereof might be compelled to see themselves under sin and condemnation, and then held forth as a soveraign remedy against damnation, and means of salvation; such re-

pentances for ſin, ſuch degrees of contrition and reformation preſcribed out of the Law, which being practiced, pardon of ſin and eternall life muſt needs follow. Thus man was made not only his own condemner, but his own Saviour alſo; his evill works in tranſgreſſing the Law purſuing him with vengeance, and his returning by repentance to good works in ſtrict obedience to the law, reſtoring him to life & ſalvation. In mean while Chriſt was left in a corner to look upon all, but without interpoſition of his operation or Paſſion. Sometimes indeed much might be heard of the riches of Gods Grace, of the efficacy of Chriſts merits to ſave the chief of ſinners, ſo that the people might even ſee the door of heaven open to them; but in concluſion, the Preacher as if he had been deputed to the office of the Cherubims, *Gen.* 2. *ult.* to keep the way of the tree of life, with his flaming ſword turning every way, affrighted the poor ſoules from all hope of entring, crying *procul hinc*, *procul ite prophani*, no prophane or unclean perſon hath right to meddle with this Grace. No, firſt they muſt have ſuch heart-preparations, purifications, and prejacent qualifications, before they draw neer to partake of mercy; muſt firſt cleanſe and cure themſelves, and then come to Chriſt afterwards; muſt be cloathed with an inherent Righteouſneſſe firſt, and then expect to be cloathed upon with a Righteouſneſſe imputed. Such hath been and ſtill is the Doctrine delivered in many Congregations within this Nation. I neither fain nor aggravate. It is that whereof my ſelf not without griefe have been oft an ear-witneſſe, and that from the mouths of very zealous Miniſters. And I fear the Lord hath a controverſie againſt the Miniſtry, and will more yet obſcure and vilifie many of them for their obſcuring of his grace and his Chriſt. Now when ſo many of them were by the tide of their own judgments moving before, not a little in Mr. *Baxters* way, no marvail if they have admitted him among themſelves to hoyſe the ſailes and carry them haſtier and further than they before had purpoſed; ſpecially when all the way along and thorowout his whole Treatiſe he deals with them as *Eliſha* did with the *Syrians*, telling them that he is leading them to *Dothan*, to *Hieruſalem*, holding their eyes and wits ſuſpended until he hath brought them into the ſtreets of *Samaria*, of *Rome* it ſelf, 2 *King.* 6. 8, &c.

This I thought fit to premiſe of the Author, the next thing promiſed was touching the work it ſelf.

Whether we conſider the matter or the artifice of it, I cannot in generall

generall otherwiſe give a livelier character or deſcription thereof, than in the words of Mr. *Fox*, in his Tractate *De Gratiâ gratis Juſtificante*, againſt *Oſorius* and others, where he gives his cenſure upon a book of the ſame argument with Mr. *Baxters*, ſet forth by *Oſorius*, not as this man under the name of a Proteſtant, but ingenuouſly profeſſing himſelf a Papiſt. Among other I may as fitly apply theſe paſſages of Mr. *Fox* to Mr. *Baxters* work, as he did it to the popiſh Biſhop. *Si quiſquam alius preter Oſorium*, &c. If any other man ſave *Oſorius* had publiſhed this Book (ſaith he) but I ſay were it not that ſome unexceptively learned and godly Divines, did thorow (I know not what miſtake) favour and even patronize this Tractate, *Dicerem ei aperté atque in os, Peſtem publicæ Chriſtianorum ſaluti, labem Religioni graviorem, majorem D. Paulo, Scripturis & Prophetis, injurium inferre neminem unquam potuiſſe quam his libris oſtenditur. i. e.* I would tell openly, and to his teeth, that no man ever could bring in a more grievous plague to the common ſafety of Chriſtians, or blemiſh to Religion, or greater injury to St. *Paul*, the Scriptures and Prophets then is held forth in this Book. And p. 4. *Ita ſentio*, &c. *Philoſophum te quidem ſatis Platonicum, & Rhetorem non male Ciceronianum video; at Theologum vero parum, mihi Crede, Evangelicum, neque ad Cauſam ipſam juſtitiæ Chriſtianæ perorandam, ſatis exercitatum. i. e.* This is my opinion, &c. [in the frame of this work] I ſee thee a Philoſopher enough Platonicall, and a Rhetorician not much beneath *Cicero*: but a Divine little ſeaſoned with the Goſpel, and unfurniſhed to treat of that Chriſtian Righteouſneſſe [that tends to juſtification.] And *pag.* 11. while he diſputeth and teacheth us many things of righteouſneſſe and juſtification, there is nothing for us to learne that comes home to the matter, not a mite that may further, but very much that may hinder ſalvation. And *pag.* 6. he likens him to *Celſus & Antipho*, mentioned by *Origen*, who when they wrote moſt eagerly againſt the truth, call'd their Books ἀλήθη λογὸν, a word or treatiſe of truth: ſo this man entitles his Book [*A diſcourſe of Juſtifying Righteouſneſs.*] I had almoſt ſaid *Aphoriſms of Juſtification, at ita ut nihil contra Veram Juſtitiam* [*vel juſtificationem*] *dici poſſit hoſtilius. i. e.* But ſo that nothing can be ſpoken more hoſtilely or hatefully againſt true righteouſneſſe and juſtification. All this is no leſſe true of, and pat unto Mr. *Baxters* than *B. Oſorius* his work. But much more pernicious in Mr. *Baxters*, becauſe he hideth his poyſon under the name and pretence of an Orthodox and Cathedrall Divine, and a great Antagoniſt to Popery.

But

But of the matter of the work I have delivered my judgment before, and ſhall have occaſion to examine it when I come to the bulk of his Treatiſe. Only at preſent I tranſmit the Reader (that would in a breviary find what the ſubſtance of his Doctrine is) to the ſecond part of this Anſwer, *Chap.* 16, 17, and neer the end of *Chap.* 22. where he may read in how many particulars he holds the ſame Tenet with the worſt, and tranſcends in many things, the more moderate of the Papiſts, yea of the very Jeſuits.

Here I ſhall ſpeak only of the form and artifice of the work, upon what foundation he hath laid, by what pillars he ſupports his own aſſertions, and with what Engins and Machinations hee oppugneth the ſacred truth, and judgment of all Orthodox Divines, whom he makes his adverſaries. In all this he followeth his Maſters the Schoolmen and Jeſuites, baulking the Scriptures, and laying maximes of Philoſophy and carnall, or at leaſt humane Reaſon as the foundation of his whole building, & walls and pillars it up with ſophiſticall Arguments, Diſtinctions, & quodlibetary ſubtleties, raiſing every where duſt and vapours to cloud and darken the Sun of truth, that he may have the opportunity with his *ignis fatuus*, to toll men out of the ſafe and ſure way into the boggs and moſt excrementitious parts of Popery. Indeed ſometimes he quotes Scriptures in heaps, (as they were prepar'd to his hands by Fryars and Jeſuits) and lets them out without meaſure or tale, telling us that he will ſtand to and be tryed by the Scriptures: but ſcarce at any time vouchſafing to make known what hee would diduce thence, and how; and many times not affording the labour to name the words, and then hyeth back to his Sanctuary St. *Sophiſtry* again: declaring both at how cheap a rate he valueth the ſacred word, not deigning either to cite the words, or at beſt to tell us what he thinks he hath found in them (when contrariwiſe if he cite any thing out of the heathen Philoſophers, or their followers, the Popiſh Doctors unnamed, he is very buſie to preſſe and improve it to his advantage) and withall, that his meaning is to be tryed by the boon ſonns of the unholy Catholick Church: therefore turns us over to them for our information what may be gathered from the Scriptures produced, himſelfe paſſing by it as a thing already done to his hands by them.

Now becauſe the main ſtrength of Mr *Baxter* and his leaders in fighting againſt the verity of the Goſpel, conſiſteth in this ſubtle and unſcripturall way of diſputation, it ſhall not be impertinent

to

to digreſſe a while in diſcuſſing what force there is in ſophiſticall, (or to uſe milder words) Logicall, Philoſophicall, and Metaphiſicall argumentations, to confirm or infirm Evangelical Doctrines. In Natural, Moral, Civil, and Oeconomical queſtions they may be (I acknowledg) very uſefull. Yea Logick in its ſober and moderate uſe, applyed as an inſtrument to aſſiſt in the contexture and retexture of Scriptures to finde out the ſenſe and meaning thereof; and further, as by diſcreet joyning of Goſpel poſitions together, it helpeth to elicite ſure and ſound concluſions, (not at all drawing the queſtion out of its own ſphere the Scriptures, to be judged and concluded by the nicities and quiddities of other beſides Scripture-learning) may be profitably uſed in Evangelicall queſtions. But neither Logick it ſelfe beyond this, nor Philoſophy or the Metaphyſicks at all, have any force to prove any thing in Goſpel-matters.

I know what to expect for ſuch a diſcourſe upon this ſubject. I ſhall be jeered at to be the Fox in the Fable, that being without a tayl, to leſſen his ſhame in a generall counſell of Foxes, made an Oration, declayming much againſt the diſcommodities which Foxes had by their tails, and labouring to perſwade them all to rid themſelves of ſuch a diſcommodity, that he might make the ſhame common, and then not the whole, but a ſhare of it only would be his.

Be it ſo, I neither arrogate nor uſurp to my ſelf the praiſe of humane learning. In reference to ſalvation and juſtification, *God forbid that I ſhould glory in any thing but in the Croſſe of Chriſt, or ſhould determine to know any thing ſave Chriſt and him crucified.* To plead my righteouſneſs; before God, and againſt Satan, the ſimplicity of the Goſpel plenarily furniſheth and contenteth me; leaving it to Mr. *Baxter* (if he think it ſafe) with ſophiſticall ſubtleties to diſpute himſelf into heaven. Gal. 6. 14. 1 Cor. 2. 2.

Nevertheleſſe the poſition ſtands firm even in the fall of the credit of the aſſertor, That ſuch humane learning is of no force to decide, judg, and conclude any thing in queſtions meerly Evangelicall, ſuch as is Juſtification, and all other Goſpel-graces and privileges. This may be with much facility evidenced to as many as have not their eyes blinded by the God of this world as yet, and that by theſe following reaſons.

1. All the Doctrines of the Goſpel are tranſcendent, high, and above the reach of the moſt ſublimated reaſon. *Eye hath not ſeen, nor*

eare

eare heard, neither hath it entred into the heart of man to know them, 1 Cor. 2. 9. The natural man receiveth not, cannot receive the things of the Spirit of God, becauſe they are ſpiritually diſcerned. ibid. *Verſ.* 14. *They are myſteries hid in God from the* beginning of the world, *from ages and generations, but at laſt made known by the Spirit in the preaching of the Goſpel*, not only to the Saints [on earth] but alſo to *the Principalities and powers in heavenly places, i. e.* to the Miniſtring Angels and Spirits before God in heaven, *Epheſ.* 13. 9, 10. *Col.* 3. 26, 27. So that at the revelation thereof by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, *the very Angels deſired to looke into them*, as learners of that ſacred Doctrine which before they had not attained, 1 *Pet.* 1. 12. But all this humane learning whereof we ſpeak, is naturall, flowing originally from naturall and heathen men, who in their either moſt profound or moſt ſublime ſpeculations, could not ſee a ſpan above Nature, no nor to the top of Nature by many fathoms. Therefore is there a totall invalidity in it to diſcern one ray of Evangelical and ſpiritual things. To produce any thing therefore out of this humane literature to diſcern and judg of Goſpel-doctrines; is no leſſe folly than to make a blind man judg of colours, or a deaf man of ſounds, or to ſet a dead man to running of a race. Yea to hold forth any thing hence, to cleer up and evidence ſpiritual things, is but to hold a candle, nay a dark Lanthorn to the Sun, for the cleering of its beams that we may ſee it.

If any obje&, that Spiritual and Evangelical Doctrines are by none brought (as Spiritual and Evangelical) under the Tryall of this humane learning, but as they fall under ſome Topicks of this or that Art or Science, as *Ens, Subſtantia, Accidens, Actio, Relatio, &c.* and ſo farr only they are diſputed of by and according to the Maximes and Canons of thoſe places.

I anſwer, that even this is to ſubject ſupernatural Doctrines to the judgment and cenſure of Natural Reaſon. It will not be denyed that the firſt Founders of theſe Arts and the precepts thereof were meerely Naturall and Morall men, and neither did nor could accommodate their precepts and rules to any other but natural and Moral things; were ſo farr unable to reach them to things ſupenatural, that they left them in many things unperfect as to things natural: ſo that after all the amendments of all their followers, not a few of their Canons remain diſputable and controverted (as to Natural and Moral things) ſtill. Therefore to proſtrate ſpiritual things to the judgment of this Natural learning, is

to

to ſubject the Authority of Chriſt to the Authority of men, the wiſdome of the Spirit to the wiſdome of the Fleſh, and that which is infallible to that which is both fallible and fallacious. Nay all the doctrines and precepts of Philoſophers are to be tryed by the word; but in no wiſe are the dictates of the Spirit, and doctrines of the word of grace to be tryed by the precepts of Men. I forbeare to ſpeak here, that otherwiſe not Chriſt but *Ariſtotle* muſt in matters of ſalvation be made our *Ipſe Dixit:* or that none but Schollars can have any ſtable ſetledneſſe of faith, the unlearned in humane literature remaining uncapable thereof, becauſe they cannot prove the truth of what they believe as well by the rules of Art, as by the Teſtimony of the word of Chriſt. I only ſay, when Chriſt by his word hath ſaid and determined, here not to ſubject and reſt ſatisfied, but to conſult with fleſh and blood, with the rules of humane Art for my fuller reſolution, is no leſſe indignity to Chriſt, than to ſet mans wiſedom in the Chair, and to proſtrate Chriſt to be his Footſtool.

2. If it have any power and efficacy to this end, it muſt be either from ſome naturall and intrinſicall vertue of its own, or elſe by Gods ordination and infuſion. Not by any naturall vertue of its own, as appeareth by what was laſt ſaid, and by this that none ever by ſuch ſecular learning attained one leaſt ſpark of Goſpel-knowledg, nor yet by Gods ordination, and inſpiring ſtrength into it to operate for ſuch an end. For let it be declared in what Scripture God inſtituted or owned it as an in-ſtrument uſefull and effectuallized for ſuch a work. And if neither of theſe ways it be powerful, or in a capacity either to declare or confirm Goſpel-matters, then hath it no power at all to ſuch a purpoſe.

If any thing be excepted againſt in this Argument, it muſt be the latter disjunctive particle thereof in the Aſſumption which denieth the humane learning before mentioned to be ordained of God, or qualified by him as inſtrumental and effectual to determine any thing in Evangelical and Spiritual Doctrines. But this may be cleered and confirmed by the Reaſons following.

1. Becauſe neither the Lord Chriſt nor any of his Apoſtles or Prophets have made uſe of it to this end. Not his Prophets under the Old Teſtament: For when they ſpake any thing of the Myſtery of Chriſt and his Goſpel that were afterward more fully to be revealed, they did it *by inſpiration from God,* 2 Tim. 3. 16. *and the revelation of the ſpirit of Chriſt which was in them,* 1 Pet. 1. 11. not as having

ving dipped the same, from the broken Cisterns of humane inventions and learning. And when they will add a confirmation to such Doctrines, the only authority which they produce is divine. *Thus saith the Lord, The Lord of Hosts hath said it, the holy, the lofty, the mighty one of Israel hath spoken it*, without any Philosophical or Metaphysical Arguments to prove it. No lesse is to be said of Christ himself our own and only Mr. when he descended from Heaven to reveal his Gospel in its fulnes and glory, affirming his *doctrine to be* onely and wholly *that which his Father taught him*, Joh. 8. 28. *which he had seene with his father*, Joh. 8. 38. *as he had commandement from his father*, Joh. 10. 18. *even as the father said unto him*, Joh. 12. 50. *as he heard from his father*, Joh. 15. 15. Lo all from heaven, from the Father; nothing from earth from men, in revealing the Gospel. No nor to the confirmation of it being revealed, save his own and his Fathers testimonie, *Joh.* 8. 18. *Joh.* 5. 31,—37. Let there be but an *iota* produced of this kind of literature whereof I treat, that our Saviour any where used for the confirmation of the Gospel-doctrines which hee delivered. Nay, hee denies all ability and possibility, that any man by naturall or acquired parts should see or shew forth (untill he hath received divine revelation) one ray of Gospel-light; Therefore when *Peter* had made but a course and confus'd or obscure confession of Christ, he answers, *Blessed be thou Simon Barjonah, for Flesh and Blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven*, Mat. 16. 16, 17. Insinuating that the very threshold of Gospel-knowledg is transcendent and above all the reach of humane Arts, and fleshly or naturall wisdome, to find it out for themselves, or make it out to others. Hence are the universal conclusions and affections which hee layeth down to this purpose. *No man can come to me except the Father draw him. It is written, they shall be all taught of God: Every man that hath heard and learned of the Father cometh to me*, Joh. 6. 44, 45. *No one knoweth the Sonn but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father but the Sonn, and he to whom the sonn will reveal him.* What he speaketh of knowing the Son and the Father, he meaneth of knowing the *minde* and *will* of God touching the Gospel-way in wch he hath purposed to bring sinners to salvation. This is a wisdome not borrowed of, but *hidden* from [most of] *the wise and prudent* [in secular learning] *and revealed to babes*, Mat. 11. 25---27. And the Scripture giveth reasons why there is no power in the wisdome and learning of men to dive into the Mystery of the Gospel, and Evangelical knowledg of God.

No

No man hath ſeene God at any time: The only begotten ſonne which is in the boſome of the Father hath declared him, Joh. 1. 18 *No man hath aſcended to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the ſonne of man which is in heaven*, Joh. 3. 13. *What man knoweth the things of a man, ſave the ſpirit of man which is in him. Even ſo the things of God knoweth no man but the ſpirit of God*, 1 Cor. 2. 11. What is here ſpoken of the knowledg of God, is to be underſtood as in the former Texts, the knowing of Gods will and myſterious way of bringing many ſons (ere while enemies) to glory. The ſcope of the Argumentation in theſe Scriptures runs thus. None but ſuch as have ſeen God, ſeen into him, have been in heaven with him, nay have been in his very heart and boſom, can poſſibly know the mind and purpoſe of God hidden in himſelf touching the juſtification and ſalvation of men. But Chriſt only & the Spirit of Chriſt have been, and are ſtill in heaven, have ſeen God, and are in the boſom of God reading and knowing all the purpoſes of his mind. Therefore none but Chriſt and his Spirit alone know and can reveale this mind of God to us. The Scripture here ſpeaketh of Teachers, none hath been in heaven to come thence as a Teacher into the world of what he hath ſeen in the boſom of God, but the Son and the Spirit: And the teaching or revealing of which it ſpeaketh, is meant original teaching and revealing. None can reveal the mind of God but the Son and the Spirit, or they to whom the Son by his Doctrine and Spirit hath firſt revealed it. What weight then can there be in the Teſtimony or learning of the Heathen Philoſophers, or of the Angelical and Seraphical Doctors of the Romiſh Church, who never aſcended the Heavens to look into Gods boſom, and are as void of Chriſt and his Spirit as thoſe Heathens themſelves; that any thing of Goſpel-wiſdome ſhould be grounded upon their authority? Joh. 1.18.

From Chriſt diſcend we to the Apoſtles, and firſt he that *choſe them to goe forth into the world to bring forth fruit*, Joh. 15. 16. (*i. e.* by the preaching of the Goſpel to bring home many ſouls to God) to furniſh them with abilities for ſo great and noble a work, promiſeth *to ſend unto them the Spirit*, and to what end but *to lead them into all truth*, Joh. 16. 13. into the cleer and full knowledg of the myſterious truths of the Goſpel, bidding them not to go to *Athens* to learn from the Philoſophers in their Schools any thing that might further their illumination herein, but *to tarry at Hieruſalem untill they were endued with this power from on high*, Luk. 24. 49. And if we

look to the accompliſhment of the promiſe, *Acts* 2. 1, &c. we ſhall finde that the Holy Ghoſt diſcending in a glorious manner upon them, wrought on them, if not only, yet principally theſe three effects as abundantly ſufficient to enable them for the *Apoſtleſhip and Miniſtry of the New Teſtament*, as the Apoſtle terms his Office, 2 *Cor.* 3. 6.

1. A ſudden and wonderfull irradiation of them with all the depths of Goſpel-knowledg, that *without communion with fleſh and blood*, they had the ſacred ſecrets of the Goſpel made out in an inſtant to them by the revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, as afterwards *Paul* manifeſteth the Lord Jeſus to have dealt with him in like manner, *Gal.* 1. 12. 16. And thus they that were but mechanick and illiterate men, were filled ſuddenly with light and knowledg enough to enlighten the whole world then in darkneſſe.

2. The gift of tongus, by which they were enabled to ſpread abroad unto all men of all nations, in their ſeverall *Languages the wonderfull things of God, i. e.* the glorious, and untill then hidden ways of ſalvation, *Act.* 2. 11.

3. A magnanimous and celeſtiall boldneſs to hold forth, defend and maintain thoſe ſacred and ſaving truths revealed to them in deſpight of all the powers of Earth and Hell banding againſt them, *Act.* 4. 13.

Here, as there is none that will deny the Apoſtles to have been ſufficiently, yea abundantly gifted for the execution of their function: ſo I do not ſo much as ſuſpect there will be any found that ſuppoſeth them to have received among the *Abundance of their Revelations* any inſpiration of the before-mentioned humane learning as uſefull and needfull to plant the knowledg of the Goſpel in the hearts of men, or to confirm it after it was planted.

And 2ly. with that learning and power ſo received, they went on in the execution of their Miniſtry, ſo far from uſing, as that they purpoſely rejected the uſe of humane reaſon and wiſdome, holding faſt to the word alone as the mind of God therein was revealed to them by the Spirit, for their rule in preaching, and authority in confirming the truth of the Goſpel which they taught. In ſtead of all, attend we to *Paul*, that *laboured more abundandantly then they all.* When he had *fully preached the Goſpel from Hieruſalem in the regions round about even to Illyricum*; he gives this account of his labors, that he had *beleeved nothing, nor witneſſed or taught any thing, ſave what is written in the law of Moſes and the Prophets*, Acts 24. 14. & 26. 22.

Rom. 15. 19.

That

That whatsoever Churches he had planted, were built by him upon the foundations of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himselfe being the chiefe corner-stone, Eph. 2. 20. Nothing here of *Aristotle* and *Plato*, but of the Prophets and Apostles, *i. e.* the Doctrine which Christ had revealed to them and by them, laid to support the Churches in the Faith of Christ. That he had utterly exploded all humane wisdom Arts, and inventions, as incompetent with the Gospel of Christ. That whether he laid in the hearts of men the principles and beginnings of Christ, having to deale with such as were but yet in converting, or else *but babes in Christ, be totally abstained from the words of mans wisdome*, from intermingling any of the artificiall disputes of the Philosophers, *that their faith might not stand in the wisdome of men, but in the power of God:* or whether he treated with *them that were perfect*, *i. e.* grown to a high stature in the knowledg and faith of Christ, even when he spake wisedom, delivered doctrines of the greatest depth and misteriousnes to them, yet was it *not the wisedome of this world, i. e.* neither was the matter thereof the doctrine of the profound *Philosophers and Disputers that were held the Princes of the world for wisdome, but the mysterie of Christ.* Neither for the confirmation thereof *did he use the words which mans wisedom teacheth, i. e.* that way of philosophicall and dialectical disputation, whereof the Philosophers give their precepts, but *in the words which the holy Ghost teacheth*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 2. 1.---13.

Now if neither Christ nor his truly inspired Ministers ever used, or would use this kind of learning in Gospel-matters, the conclusion will necessarily follow that it was never of Gods ordination. For *Christ was faithfull in his house the Church*, Heb. 3. 2, 6. *and finished the worke which his Father had given him to do*, Joh. 17. 4. And the like may be truly affirmed and confirmed of the faithfulnesse of all those truly inspired Ministers of Christ, according to their measure, that with *Paul* they *were stewards of God*, and studied so earnestly *to be found faithfull, that they knew nothing by themselves to accuse themselves of falshood or neglect*, 1 Cor. 4. 1, 2. 4. *That they kept back nothing which was profitable to the people, but declared to them the whole Counsell of God, therefore were pure from the blood of all men:* so that it must follow, that either the use of the aforesaid humane learning in Gospel-matters is no ordinance of God, and at the best unprofitable: or else that Christ and his Apostles not using it, yea rejecting the use of it, were not faithfull. But all will deny the latter, therefore must grant the former. Act. 20. 20. 26, 27.

A second

A ſecond Reaſon to prove it not to be an ordinance of God, &c. I may draw from the ſlighting, abaſing, and invective terms which the Holy Ghoſt in Scripture uſeth againſt it. The wiſedom of the Holy Ghoſt doth in no wiſe ſlight any ordinance of God qualified and bleſſed by him to Goſpel-ends. But the uſe of thoſe humane pieces of learning whereof I am ſpeaking is much ſlighted and abaſed by the H: G: as impotent and unuſefull to Goſpel-work and ends, Ergo, &c. That the H: G: doth thus ſlight it in Scripture, to omit what the Lord Chriſt ſpeaks againſt the traditionary learning of the *Jewiſh* Rabbies, *Mat.* 15. 1.- 9. & 23. 13, &c. & 11. 25, 26. *Joh.* 9. 29---41. I ſhall mention only how contemptuouſly the H: G: by the Apoſtles pointing directly to this Gentilizing learning, ſpeaks of it. *They became vain in their imaginations* (ſaith he) *and their foolish heart was darkened; Profeſſing themſelves wiſe, they became fools, and changed the glory of God into a corruptible image*, &c. What more to the abaſing of their learning? he calls it at the beſt, the very froth of light fancies and imaginations, the darkneſſe of fooliſh hearts, a profeſſion of ſuch wiſedom as made them groſſe fools; that as it acted about religion and the way to happineſſe, it made both it and them a very abhomination to the Lord.

Rom. 1. 21 ---23.

Again, *The preaching of the Croſſe is to them that periſh, fooliſhneſſe. As it is written, I will deſtroy the wiſedom of the wiſe, & bring to nothing the underſtanding of the prudent. Where is the wiſe? where is the Scribe? where is the diſputer of this world? hath not God made fooliſh the wiſedom of this world? For after that in the wiſedom of God, the world by wiſedom knew not God, it pleaſed God by the fooliſhneſſe of preaching to ſave them that believe*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 1. 18---21, &c.

How differing is the ſpirit of our Sophiſters from the Spirit which wrought in the Apoſtle? He pronounceth this Sophiſticall learning, to be ſo far from being a furtherance to the only true which is the Goſpel-way of ſalvation, as that it is an enemie to it, rejects it as fooliſhneſſe.

2. Them that follow it as their rule and authority what to believe and do, that they may be ſaved, to be in a periſhing condition, in the ready way to damnation. They that periſh account the ſimplicity of the Goſpel without the ſulture, or rather tainture of their Arts, fooliſhneſſe.

3. He affirms God to be an enemy to it, to deteſt any patronage from it to his myſterious Doctrine of the Goſpel. He hath left it upon record to curb wanton wits, that he will deſtroy the wiſedome, &c.

4. That

4. That according to his threat, he hath executed, and will ſtill fulfill, therefore challengeth the Sophiſters to give anſwer from their own experience at laſt, whether God hath not, doth not alway ſo curſe this wiſedom of theirs, that it turns to ruine and fooliſhneſſe? *Where is the Scribe? where the Diſputer?* &c. *Hath not God?* &c.

5. That it is a knowledg by which men know not God, which while they purſue, they loſe utterly the ſaving knowledg of God.

6. That in contempt of this ſecular learning, God will by the ſimplicity and fooliſhneſſe of Goſpel-preaching ſave them that believe, leaving the Diſputers to reaſon themſelves into Hell. It pleaſed God, *&c.*

Unto this I ſhal add but two Teſtimonies more; the one, when the Apoſtle hath to do with a company of Chriſtians dwelling among the Philoſophers, in great jealouſie & fear of them, he cryes out, *Beware ye be not ſpoiled with Philoſophy, Col* 2.7. & vain deceit. He ſpeaks of no poſſibility of any good that there ſhould accrew unto them by the help of Philoſophy, but of great danger to be ſpoyled and corrupted by it; and when is there ſuch hazard of being corrupted by it? he anſwers, when men intermingle this learning, which is but of humane invention and *tradition*, *after the Rudiments of the world*, after and not above carnall and worldly *Reaſon*, with the Scripture, in meaſuring out to themſelves the ſaving Goſpel, and take not it up *after Chriſt* ſimply and unmixedly as Chriſt hath taught it, and put the impreſſe of his authority upon it, *Coloſſ.* 2.8. The other that for prevention of corruption by this ſecular learning, the Converts of *Epheſus*, while the Apoſtle was yet reſident among them, and conſequently conſenting with them, *burnt their bookes of curious Arts*, which though ſome will have to be underſtood of conjuring books, yet I cannot aſſent to them, becauſe this curſed rather then curious Art, was proper and almoſt peculiar to the more Eaſtern people, *Jewes*, *Samaritans*, *Ægyptians*, and *Babylonians*; the *Greeks* very little or not at all ſtudying it, but placing all their wiſdom in the Arts whereof I have been hitherto diſcourſing, and theſe were *Greeks* that burnt the bookes of thoſe curious Arts which they ſtudied, *Act.* 19. 19. If then any conclude that the H: Ghoſt at any time doth ſo much abaſe and deface an Ordinance of God; Let him alſo conclude this kind of learning and diſputation to be ordained of God for the confirming and promoting of the Goſpel.

A third

A third Reason to prove that God hath not ordained this Sophisticall or Philosophicall learning to be instrumentall for the promoting of the Gospel, may be drawn from experince it self. That wch we never find to be blessed, but still blasted of God to the hurt both of the Churches that have been admirers and followers of Sophisticall teachers of the Gospel, and of such teachers also, cannot be the Ordinance of God; for he alway accompanieth and breaths his blessing in greater or lesser degrees upon the due execution of his own Ordinances. But God hath never blessed, but still so blasted and brought to nought & naught, &c. the use of this philosophicall and philosophastrous learning. *Ergo*, It is not of Gods ordination, I mean to be intermingled with spirituall, and Evangelicall Doctrines. For hence alone we banish it, not denying it to be usefull in naturall and morall things, as I have before granted.

That it hath been so blasted as intermingled with Gospel-doctrines, experience it self evidenceth. Trace we down from the very primitive age of the Gospel Church unrill our times, Gods operations, in the Gospels and Churches waxings and wainings, and we shall find his blessing to have been upon the pure preaching of the Gospel; his curse upon the mixings and medleys of mans wisedom with it. Begin we with the Apostles times, when these went forth acting only by the authority of Christs mission, and according to the rule of his Commission, the very *Devills became subject to them, and Satan fell as lightning before them*, at the sound of the Gospel which they had charge to preach alone, and ground upon the authority of the Scripture alone, while this charge was faithfully put in execution, whole Nations either after the other, yea the whole world [almost] came to be discipled to Christ. *God working mightily with them by many signes and wonders to make their Ministry successfull.* But when anon there entred into the Churches rightly grounded and stablished, false Apostles of the *Jewes* that preached a legall and naturall righteousnesse that reason and naturall conconscience could suggest (if the Law of *Moses* had been silent) as necessary to be joyned with the Gospel-righteousnesse of Faith to Justification: And on the other side there arose out of the Churches of the Gentiles some of themselves *that spake perverse things seeking to introduce the like* naturall righteousnesse out of the Ethicks of the Philosophers, and to maintain their Doctrines, mainly if not wholly by *Aristotles* dialectick subtleties: And both these began to

be

be favoured by wanton wits within the Churches : Now the Lord turned his hinder parts to them on whom erewhile the light of his countenance ſhined, the glory of the Goſpel became more and more clouded, the Churches rended and torn in pieces, abounding more with Apoſtates than with Chriſtians indeed, as may be largely manifeſted from the New Teſtament if there were need.

From the Apoſtles time diſcend we to the next ages or age after the Apoſtles, and I find not among the Writers of note any one much ſtudious of Philoſophy (much leſſe ſpoyled with it) *Clemens Alexandrinus* only excepted, and he enough moderate in the uſe of it. But ſhortly after him ſprung up *Origen*, a great and copious Writer : in his youth beyond his age hopefull, but in his maturity carryed with full ſails to the ſtudy of ſecular Arts, and with ſuch ſucceſſe, that *Hierom* in his Catalogue of *Eccleſiaſticall Writers* renders him in ſuch learning unmatchable by any going before, or following him ; as one thorowly ſeen in all the differing opinions of all the ſeverall ſects of Philoſophers, a notable Logician and Diſputer, and fully read in all the Liberall Arts, and as remarkable for the practical part as the Theory of all.

Now from a man ſo accompliſht in ſo many perfections (as ſome term them) would poſſibly be expected a greater ſucceſſe of his preaching and writing than ever *Paul* attained, becauſe ſo much more learned then *Paul*: But the caſe proved contrary. Out of his brain thus filled, iſſued errors and hereſies as thick as hail-ſtones from the Clouds. Nothing of Scripture, Law or Goſpel could eſcape his depravation, and a Religion he ſet forth, like *Mahomets* Alcaron, a meer galleymaufry of Heterogeneous fancies, ſome *Jewiſh*, ſome *Heatheniſh*, and ſome in ſhew at leaſt *Chriſtian*, compounded and confounded one with the other, ſo that there could not be a fouler abhomination then ſuch a Religion. Why ? becauſe he had attained ſo much ſecular learning? not ſo, but becauſe he wrought with untempered morter, mixing Philoſophy and Chriſtianity together, which cloſe as ſweetly as light and darkneſſe. Hence was it that all the Churches at length exploded him for an Heretick, and his writings as Pſeudo-Chriſtian ; and *Hierom* ſo wounded his reputation among the learned and godly, for writing ſomewhat in the praiſe of him, that with all his palliating and recanting, hee could not fully repayr it to his dying day. Yea the ſtinch of him hath offended all the godly Divines of our Reformed Churches, notwithſtanding his antiquity, that they reje& him. From the

pen of one *Beza*, we may know the mind of the reſt, who calls him *hominem impuram* ſometimes, and ſometimes *hominum impuriſſimum*, an impure or a prophane man, yea the prophaneſt of men, for prophaning Scriptures, Goſpel, Religion, and all other ſacred things that he medled with.

At no long diſtance after *Origen* lived *Tertullian*, who finding the Church by the evill Artifice of *Origen*, and other Philoſophicall Chriſtians like him, over ſpread with hereſies, applies himſelfe to ſeek the cure thereof. And a principall means he preſcribeth hereunto, is a faſt adhering to the doctrine of Chriſt, all other authority in divine things being rejected. *It is not lawfull for us* (ſaith he) *to bring in any thing* [*of faith or worſhip*] *out of our own will or judgment, nor to admit any thing what another hath introduced of his will and judgment. Apoſtolos Domini habemus auctores, qui nec ipſe quicquam ex ſuo Arbitrio quod inducerunt, elegerunt, ſed acceptam a Chriſto diſciplinam fideliter nationibus adſignaverunt, i. e.* We have the Apoſtles of the Lord herein our authors or patterns, who neither made choiſe of any thing from their owne invention, to impoſe [upon Chriſtians] but faithfully delivered to the Nations the diſcipline which they had received from Chriſt. So that if an Angel from heaven ſhall preach any other doctrine let him be accurſed. And having mentioned ſome doctrines not of Chriſts preſcribing, pronounceth of all ſuch, *Hæ ſunt doctrinæ hominum & Dæmoniorum prurientibus auribus natæ, de ingenio ſapientiæ ſæculi*, &c. *i. e.* Theſe are Doctrines of men and Devills ſprung forth from itching eares, of the nature of the wiſdome of the world, which the Lord calling fooliſhneſſe, hath choſen the fooliſh things of the world even to the confuſion of Philoſophy it ſelf. *Ea eſt n. Materia ſapientiæ ſæcularis*, &c. For *this* [*Philoſophy*] *is the matter of worldly wiſdome: a raſh interpreter of the nature and diſpenſations of God, from it Hereſies are ſuborned.* And having particularized what ſeverall hereſies have been foyſted into the Church from the ſeverall ſects of Philoſophers, and what from all conjoyned, and inveighed againſt *Ariſtotles* Logick as an enemie to Chriſtian Religion, he thus breaks forth. *Quid ergo Athenis & Hieroſolymis? Quid Academiæ & Eccleſiæ? Quid hæreticis & Chriſtianis? Noſtra inſtitutio de porticu Solomonis eſt*, &c. *Viderint qui Stoicum & platonicum, & Dialecticum Chriſtianiſmum protulerunt*, &c. *i. e.* what then hath *Athens* to do with *Jeruſalem?* the Academy with the Church? Hereticks with Chriſtians? Our Inſtitution [in Religion] is out of the porch of *Solomon*, &c. Let them look to it that have hatched

Tertul. l. de præſcript. adverſ. Hæreticos.

out

out a Stoicall, Platonicall, and Logicall Christianity to us. *We have no need of curiosity after Christ, nor of inquisitivenesse after the Gospel. When we believe* [*viz.* Christ and his Gospel] *wee desire nothing beyond believing. For this we believe first, that there is not* [*viz.* in Philosophy or other Arts] *any thing that we ought to believe* [unto salvation] *beyond* [*the Gospel of Christ.*] And a little after, *he that is not satisfied with the Scripture, but seekes further authority from reason and Philosophy, his curious inquisitivenesse argues him either not to believe, or else to be vain-glorious in seeking after the praise of worldly wisdom, therefore annexeth* this counsell, *Cedat curiositas fidei, cedat gloria saluti, i.e.* let curiosity give place to faith, and vain-glory stoop to salvation. So much and much more not unworthy the reading, hath *Tertullian* in this Book. And none will easily affirm that *Tertullian* condemns that learning which himselfe wanted, to hide his own nakednesse. All his polemicall works or controversall writings declare the contrary, specially his book against *Hermogenes*, where having to deale with one that little regarded the Scriptures, sets upon him in his own fortresse, and assails him with his own weapons, and philosophically convinceth the Philosophaster, and dialectically the Sophister, in his own arts and element, confuting and confounding him.

But some may object, that seeing he holds the use of these arts unnecessary and hurtfull to Christian Religion, why doth himself make use of them? Himself both moves and answers the question elsewhere, and thus puts the question, *Whether there be not some truths to be found in philosophy?* and 2ly. *whether a Christian may not in some case make use of it in his disputations?* *Tertul. de Anima. lib.*

His answer is somewhat large, the summ and brief of it runs in this tenor: That it is not to be denyed but there are some truths delivered by Philosophers in the more common and open things of Divinity, *i.e.* (as I granted before) in naturall and morall things, and those we are to take up, not for the authority of the Phylosophers, who by the groping light of Nature have by a kind of blind happinesse found out and deliverd the same: but for the authority of God, who by his undeceiving word hath manifested it to us, and further that in our disputes with such to whom the prescripts of philosophy are more authoritative and authentick than the oracles of the word, when it may be done without prejudice to the word, we may retort upon the adversarie his own arguments, and stop his mouth with testimonies of Philosophers, which to him are

moſt authentick. Nevertheleſs it is the ſafeſt and moſt pious way when wee treat with Hereticks that profeſſe Chriſtians, to hold them cloſe to the Scriptures. *Tertul. lib. de Reſur. carnis.* *Auſer Hæreticis quæ cum Ethnicis ſapiunt*, ſaith he, *ut de ſolis ſcripturis quæſtiones ſuas ſiſtant, & ſtare non potuerint*, *i.e.* Take from the Heretieks thoſe arguments which they draw from heathen learning, that they may ſtate their queſtions from the Scriptures alone, and they will not be able to ſtand.

With *Tertullian* conſented the judgment of the ſound and orthodox Fathers which lived after him, during the firſt ſix hundred years in the Chriſtian Church, and my purpoſe was to demonſtrate it from the very words of ſuch of them as I have read; but finding the Preface ſwelling above its meaſure already, and the little or no uſe which they make of theſe pieces of learning, in their works, enough declaring their judgments, that they held the ſame uſeleſs and ſuperflous at leaſt: in all their writings holding themſelves faſt to the word, not medling with prophane arts to help or back the Goſpel of Chriſt, ſaving when they were neceſſitated to diſabuſe the people, in diſcovering the fallacies of the *Manichees*, *Arrians*, and other ſophiſtical Hereticks: I think it more pertinent to eaſe my ſelf of this burthen. By the way only noting that as *Julian*, when he gave his mind once inordinately to the ſtudy of philoſophy, and coveted to be a learned and philoſophical Chriſtian, did quickly declare himſelf to be an Apoſtat, and no Chriſtian: So the like apoſtacy (no doubt) by the like means befell many others, though not openly declared. And this muſt needs follow in part upon all ſuch as make not the word to be the whole foundation of their faith, but ſo farr only as it hath reaſon and philoſophy conſenting with it. But the word of the Goſpel is tranſcendent above the reach of Philoſophy and natural reaſon, they cannot comprehend it to give teſtimony to it, ſo that to make reaſon the touch-ſtone of Goſpel-doctrines and truths, is the ready way to apoſtatize from Chriſt and his Goſpel, although the ſelf-deceivers declare not their apoſtacy, but profeſſ Chriſtianity ſtill. To be a Chriſtian only ſo far as the very extracts and ſpirits of natural reaſon ſuggeſt cauſe ſo to be, is to be a Chriſtian only in name, but as void of the truth and power of Chriſtianity, as are the very Pagans that never heard of Chriſt.

I come now to ſpeak of the fatall (if I may ſo term it) and almoſt totall ruine of the Church and Goſpel. Towards the end of that which is called the Primitive Church, and of them which are dignified

dignified with the name of the ancient Fathers of the Church: As the *Saracens* invaded the Eaſtern Churches, ſo a moſt ſtupendous and barbarous people, not onely unchriſtian, but alſo inhumane, the *Gothſ* and *Vandals*, made incurſions upon theſe Weſtern Churches with one ſwelling tide, carrying all at once before them, and made impreſſion into *Italy* it ſelf, and ſeizing on *Rome*, made it their imperiall City; and reigning over, or at leaſt moleſting all thoſe nations which in this weſtern part of the world were then termed Chriſtians, made it their work for more then a hundred years not only to raze out the very being of chriſtianity from the earth, but alſo all polite learning, filling all things and places with their barbariſm, which alſo in length of time they accompliſhed almoſt to the utmoſt.

Now when at length by the valour of *Carolus Magnus* they were diſcomfited, and wholly driven out of theſe chriſtian Lands, after their ſubverſion, there ſprung out of the Barbariſm which they left behind them, a *Barabarian* ſect of Divines, more pernicious to Religion then the *Gothſ* & *Vandals* had been. In a general term they are uſually called Schoolmen or School-Doctors. Theſe like the *Babel*-builders erected upon other foundations, and of other materials a *Babel*-Church, with ſuch barbarous ſlime in ſtead of cement and morter, as was never before uſed ſince the firſt building of the old *Babel*; who exauctorating Chriſt and his Goſpel from having any ſoveraignty in matters of Religion, and permitting them but now and then to peep for their advantage, canoniz'd *Ariſtotle* the moſt ſubtle, but untill then the leaſt regarded of all the ſects of Heathen Philoſophers, to be their *ipſe dixit*, choſe *Peter Lombards* ſentences to be their Text, themſelves to be the Commentators. The matter of their Commentary, a *Miſcellane*, partly of the excrements of their own brains, partly of *moralities*, *legalities*, *formalities*; and partly of *ſuperſtitions*, *idolatries* and *hereſies* borrowed, ſome from the *Jewes*, ſome from the *Heathen*, and the reſt from *Hell* it ſelf. The Language in which all is ſet forth, no Language, but being cought out in ſyllabical, barbarous, and bombaſtical ſounds of their own coining, would better fit the bellowing of a beaſt, than the utterance of men; or if the utterance of men, more beſeeming Conjurers and Charmers than Divines. The God whom they ſerve and ſacrifice unto in all is not Chriſt but Antichriſt, whoſe commands and decrees aſſoon as they have received, they muſt and will with all their Hyperborean conjurations of ghaſtly words, definitions,

nitions, argumentations, and a cell or hell full of diſtinctions, maintain them to be from heaven, though they ſmell of nothing but hell it ſelf. Nimble work-men, leaving a glory upon their diſputes when they meet with ſublunary matter, with a ſubject not above the comprehenſion of natural reaſon, but ſuch whereof all men have an idea or image within their Synteriſis, or natural conſcience; but when they meet with Goſpel-doctrine, that makes men wiſe to ſalvation, blinder than *Balaam*, that ſaw leſs than his Aſſe which hee rode upon. Theſe have erected and held up many hundred years a religion which can ſave none, but damneth all that cleave ſtrictly to it, and they have this peculiar vertue that they have ſtill waxed worſ and worſ, the ſecond generation more impure than the firſt, and the third than the ſecond, and ſo lineally every generation almoſt until now: ſave that in theſe laſt times they have attained ſo much of the ſubtlety, falſhood and impiety of Satan, that there is ſcarce a poſſibility of receiving a further addition. If then any man will read how far the humane Learning of which I am ſpeaking, may be helpful to propagate & maintain the truth of the Goſpel, let him but look back to the fruit of theſe ſophiſtical Doctors Labours theſe many hundred years laſt paſt, and by that which hee ſeeth he ſhalbe able to anſwer himſelf, *viz.* that it hath been and is powerful to deface and ſubvert utterly the whole truth and ſalvation of the Goſpel in relation to their Diſciples that reſt upon their Learning and Precepts: for look what of Religion, worſhip and ordinances there is in the Popiſh Church, the praiſe of it redounds to philoſophy and ſophiſtry the main inſtruments of laying its ground-work, and the ſole inſtruments (unleſs ye will annex to it the fire and fagot, and tyrannical inquiſition) for the maintenance thereof.

Having ſeen how great a corruption, and how long a deſolation of the truth of Religion there hath been, while Sophiſtry was made its perfidious Advocate. We are now in the next place to conſider how the ſame truth of Chriſtian Religion thrived when delivered out of the captivity of, and communion with this ſecular Learning.

After the long holding of the purity of the Goſpel in unrighteouſnes, by theſe Theologaſters, it pleaſed God to raiſe up to himſelf for the reformation of his Church, men of his own choiſe, and gifted with a meaſure of the Spirit, anſwering ſo great a work to which they were deputed; as *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, and many other learned

learned and godly men, ſome their contemporaries, ſome their followers. Theſe reſtored the Scriptures to light again, which had been many hundred years buried in darknes, and preached again the true and clear Goſpel which had been long alſo clouded with mens inventions, traditions and ſuperſtitions. What ſucceſs this their Miniſtry had, cannot be unknown to them that know any thing of the hiſtory of thoſe times. Diſciples came in by thouſands and ten thouſands unto Chriſt, being totally revolted from Antichriſt. Whole Kingdoms, Nations, Dukedoms, that ere while worſhipped the Beaſt, now fell flat at the feet of Chriſt to ſubmit to his Scepter. And this not as conſtrained by the command of their Magiſtrates or Lawes, but even while Magiſtrates and Laws ſlept, yea when Magiſtrates and Laws perſecuted with Fire and Sword all that went this way: even then *the Kingdom of heaven ſuffered violence, and the violent tooke it by force*, *i. e.* by an unreſiſtible conviction of the word, and wonderful operation of this Spirit upon their ſouls, they were carryed out in contempt of all dangers and perſecutions to receive the Lord Jeſus Chriſt purely revealed in his righteouſnes, beawty and ſalvation to them. So that in few years, maugre all the malice of the Pope, Emperour, Kings, Princes, World, and Hell, Chriſt might be even ſeen reigning in the midſt of his Enemies, and whole Lands, at leaſt great multitudes of many Lands which were darknes, became light in the Lord, even ſo farr as we ſee the Proteſtant Religion at this day propagated.

If it be demanded here, how it came to paſs that the word and truth of Religion in ſo ſhort a time, ſo mightily grew and prevailed, that ſo great a part of the world from ſo ſmall and even deſpicable a beginning, became ſo fully and ſo quickly ſeaſoned with it? It were a full anſwer (I acknowledg) to ſay, *It was the Lords time, and he would ſo have it.*

But becauſe the Lords operations are all done in wiſdom, truth, and righteouſneſs, an inferiour ſubordinate cauſe viſible to our eies may be alſo alledged: when the Lord had purpoſed to do this great work, he ordained and fitted inſtruments for it. The Miniſters which he employed the firſt threeſcore years and upward about the work of Reformation, were ſuch as clave only and wholly to the word, both in preaching and defending the ſacred truth of the Goſpel, minding only Chriſt Jeſus, not ſeeking their own things, their own greatneſs, glory and praiſe, but the things of Chriſt. Denyed all other authority ſave Chriſts, knew no other, admitted no other

other Maſter, to define and determine any thing in matters of Religion but Chriſt alone. Therefore whether they provoked the Adverſaries, or were provoked by them to diſputation, their challenge, or receiving the challenge, was ſtil upon this condition, that the Word alone muſt be umpire in all things. Thus they had Diſputes before the Emperour *Charls* the 5. ſo they offered themſelves to be diſputers in the Councel of *Trent*. But ſtill refuſed the authority of *Ariſtotle*, and his genuine ſons *Thom: Aquinas*, *John Duns*, *Scotus*, and the whole rabble of their followers, and all the teſtimonies and learning of ſuch, as incompetent Judges of heavenly things. Thus theſe holy men ploughed the Lords field, with his own Heyfers, and ſowed it with his own ſeed, therefore he gave ſo large an encreaſe. They preached (as they had commandment and commiſſion from him) only his Goſpel, and all and only whatſoever he had commanded them, therefore according to his promiſe he was with them giving a bleſſing.

But if it be further demanded, how it came to paſs at laſt that there was a ſtop to the glorious proceedings of the ſucceſs of the Miniſtry of the Goſpel theſe laſt ſixty years, that we ſee not any further propagation of the truth, but Antichriſt rather regaining ſtrength than loſing, and the kingdom of Chriſt rather declining than increaſing?

I anſwer, that as about that time the new ſect of *Loyalla*, the Jeſuits, came to ſome maturity, who being *ſpes ultima Romæ ruenti*, the laſt ſubſidiary help of the Romiſh nodding and falling power, perceived that they might ſeek but not find any ſulture from the Scriptures to their fainting cauſe; therefore applied themſelves to the ſtudy of *Ariſtotle* the Pagan, and the Schoolmen the Semi-pagans, drinking into themſelves their ſophiſtry, and refining it into ſom-what a purer Language, (though moſt of them retain a ſcholaſtical ſtyle ſtill): And being thus furniſhed, they provoke our Divines to a diſpute, objecting againſt them, that through their ignorance and illiterate ſottiſhneſs, they dared not to diſpute ſcholaſtically, therefore ſtill cryed *Scripture*, *Scripture*, to hide their want of Schollarſhip from the eyes of men. As about that time (I ſay) there were in ſuch an operation, a new kind of *Antagoniſts* againſt the power of the Goſpel: So on our part in many Churches, there ſucceeded the former Worthies, about the ſame time, Paſtors in their own eyes poſſibly of a more noble, but in ſpiritual eyes of a baſer mettall: who to evade that ſcandal laid upon us by the Adverſaries,

verſaries, that we deſtroyed good works by our Doctrine of free Grace through Chriſt, preached ſome mens inventions, ſuperſtitions, and traditions; others meer moralities, legalities, or duties after the tenor of the Law, ſcarce touching upon the ſtrings of the Goſpel to tune up the Juſtification, Life, Liberty, Peace, Joy, and other priviledges which are by Chriſt: And to gain to themſelves an applauſe and opinion among men of their univerſal Learning, aſſented to the forenamed Challengers to diſcend to them in their own Field, and to traverſe their Diſputes about heavenly things after the rules of worldly wiſedom, thus baſely proſtituting the cauſe and doctrine of the Lord Chriſt, to the cenſure and arbitration of Heathen Philoſophers, and of *John Duns*, and other enemies to the purity of the Goſpel. For in trying all by their learning, by the light of Reaſon which they have dazled and ſophiſticated with their rules and precepts, is to make them judges of Chriſt and his Goſpel, how farr they ſhall ſtand or fall. Who can deny, but in ſtead of the former Eagles which the Church had, that ſtil beheld the Sun of righteouſnes, to fetch their light from his beams; we had now Owls that looked downward, and pitched upon the elements and rudiments of the world and worldly learning (as the Apoſtle terms them, *Col.* 2.8.) to fetch light & authority thence in pretence to maintain the truth, but in deed and ſucceſſe to betray it? No marvell if in this caſe Chriſt hath with-drawn himſelf and his bleſſing from ſuch Apologiſts for his Cauſe, which plead for him with ſuch a kind of argumentation as is worſe then totall ſilence. For what of Chriſt is there in ſuch diſputes? when the firſt ſyllogiſm, or its proſſyllogiſm, or a diſtinction, diverts the queſtion from all the liſts of Divinity, into Philoſophy or Metaphyſicks, *&c.* and not the leaſt parcell or particle of Scripture is any more heard of through the whole diſputation? It is but as it falls out ſometimes between two Apes, that having a heap of ſhels caſt before them which they take for nuts, inconſiderately break out into a skirmiſh, rending in pieces either the others jackets, and then with tooth and nail wound either the others hides, untill the weaker yeeld the victory to the ſtronger, and the Conquerour by his victory gets nothing but ſhels to break his teeth, not a kernell to ſtay his hunger: So when a queſtion in Divinity once tranſlated and removed into Logick, in this element to be tryed, there is notable jangling, untill one of the Antagoniſts that hath the ſtronger front, and more ſubtle brain, and clamorous voyce, hath put the other to ſilence,

and then one is as wise and as great a gainer as the other. For the question is *adhuc sub judice*, where it was, it was above all logicall and metaphysical notions to decide it. I acknowledg that in such disputes it hath much delighted me sometimes to find the sophistical fallacies of an adversary detected and shamed in a logicall way by some of our Divines. Yet this in no wise either doth or should satisfie me as touching the question, untill I find the true assertion confirmed by Scripture it self. One testimony from above in this case is of more worth and weight than a thousand volumes of Arguments drawn out of worldly wisdom which is from beneath.

And lest I should be taken as singular in this peece of prattle (as Mr. *Baxter* will term it) I shall mention in stead of many, two famous modern Writers, the one speaking with reference to the times past, the other to the time present and to come.

Amesius Bellar. Enervo. Tom. 4. Lib. 6. Cap. 1. p. 136.

Palam est (saith *Amesius*) *Patres ex Philosophia introduxisse in Ecclesiam varios modos loquendi, precipuè de meritis humanis, & de Justitia Evangelij, qui in scripturis non comparent; & inde occasionem datam & arreptam Scholasticis fuisse, pernicioſos errores fabricandi. i. e.* It is apparent that the Fathers have out of Philosophy brought into the Church, various ways of speaking, especially of mans merits, and of Gospel-righteousness, which do not appear in Scriptures: And that occasion hath been thereby given to, and caught or raught by the School-Doctors to frame many Errors. And *Bullinger* seeing this way of disputation beginning to peep and shew it self in its time, within the reformed Churches, having before described them that give their minds over-much to the study of Philosophy and Logick, that they became such as are unuseful for the edification of the Church, and in stead thereof, *Disputatores rixosi fiunt, censores superbissimi, nihil aliud quàm disputationes & rixas spirantes, omnia aliorum*, &c. *arrogantissimè consentes, arrodentes, & malignè cavillantes, Scholarum & Ecclesiarum pestes, ex quibus venenum altercationum, simultatum*, &c. *effunditur in Ecclesiam, i. e.* become brawling disputers, proud censurers, breathing nothing but disputes and janglings, most arrogantly censuring, snarling, and malignly cavilling at other mens labours, *nisi quod eorum capitibus gravidis admodulatum sit prescriptisq; regulis congruant*, if they be not tuned to their heads great with Child, and congruent with their rules and precepts [of Art;] The very plagues of Schools and Churches, out of which the poyson of brawlings, divisions, and distractions is powred out into the Church: Having thus described them, hee thus concludes

in

in reference to the times past, *Equidem feliciter nunquam cessit Ecclesiæ, quando homines docti & studiosi, deserta simplicitate & puritati verbi dei, aliò converterunt oculos, neq; hos unicè in solum verbum Dei collimârunt, i.e.* Verily it hath never thrived well in the Church, when learned and studious men, forsaking the simplicity and purity of Gods word, have glanced their eyes on some other thing, and not fixed them only upon Gods word. And thus in reference to the times to come and present; *Si hodiè quoq; pergamus scripturis sanctis male copulare philosophiam, & illas superstitiosè ad disputationes revocare, ac sub regulas cogere humanas, vel Artium; corrumpemus & ipsi in scholis, grandi cum Ecclesiæ detrimento, sinceritatem doctrinem Apostolicæ, i. e.* If in our times also we proceed evilly to couple together the Scriptures and Philosophy, and to call the Scriptures but outsidely or in a shew to our disputations, reducing them to the rules of men, and of the Arts, we also shall to the great disadvantage of the Church, corrupt the sincerity of Apostolical doctrine in the Schools. So much said *Bullinger*, a Classical Divine of his time neither without eminent learning, nor an enemie to it, for more than a 100 years sithence, in the last of those decads of Sermons which he set forth in print, *Anno* 1549. how long before the Edition thereof it was preached is uncertain. Yet gives after all this to humane literature its due praise: *Interim certum est* (saith he) *bonas Artes vel literas plurimum facere ad perspicuitatem & evidentiam; sed moderatè cum judicio, religiosè adhibitas, ut imperium relinquatur sacris literis, serviant autem omnes Artes exoticæ, i. e.* Mean while it must be granted that good Arts and Learning contribute much to the cleering and evidencing [of things] so that they be moderately, judiciously, and religiously made use of, and the Scripture be still left as Empress, and all extraneous Arts as handmaids (not to justle it aside, or sit in Chair with it, but) to do service to it. *Bulling. Ser. Decad. 5. Serm. 10.*

In some things, in many things I grant the rules of these Arts, (when agreeing with Scripture) to be usefull to make out the absurdity or rationality of a mans reasoning about divine things: But except they could be proved universally, and in all parts perfect and indeficient, it is neither safe nor warrantable to yeeld up our faith and judgment in Gospel-matters to their determination.

This ingenuity therefore is to be attributed to M. *Baxter*, that he doth (though not professedly, yet actually) to this end come armed *a Cap ad Pe*, with this kind of learning, to destroy, not to maintain that sacred and fundamentall point of the Gospel, Justification of

and then one is as wiſe and as great a gainer as the other. For the queſtion is *adhuc ſub judice*, where it was, it was above all logicall and metaphyſical notions to decide it. I acknowledg that in ſuch diſputes it hath much delighted me ſometimes to find the ſophiſtical fallacies of an adverſary detected and ſhamed in a logicall way by ſome of our Divines. Yet this in no wiſe either doth or ſhould ſatisfie me as touching the queſtion, untill I find the true aſſertion confirmed by Scripture it ſelf. One teſtimony from above in this caſe is of more worth and weight than a thouſand volumes of Arguments drawn out of worldly wiſedom which is from beneath.

And leſt I ſhould be taken as ſingular in this peece of prattle (as Mr. *Baxter* will term it) I ſhall mention in ſtead of many, two famous modern Writers, the one ſpeaking with reference to the times paſt, the other to the time preſent and to come.

Ameſ. Bellar. Enero. Tom. 4. Lib. 6. Cap. 1. p. 136.

Palam eſt (ſaith *Ameſius*) *Patres ex Philoſophia introduxiſſe in Eccleſiam varios modos loquendi, precipuè de meritis humanis, & de Juſtitia Evangelij, qui in ſcripturis non comparent; & inde occaſionem datam & arreptam Scholaſticis fuiſſe, pernicioſos errores fabricandi. i. e.* It is apparent that the Fathers have out of Philoſophy brought into the Church, various ways of ſpeaking, eſpecially of mans merits, and of Goſpel-righteouſneſs, which do not appear in Scriptures: And that occaſion hath been thereby given to, and caught or raught by the School-Doctors to frame many Errors. And *Bullinger* ſeeing this way of diſputation beginning to peep and ſhew it ſelf in its time, within the reformed Churches, having before deſcribed them that give their minds over-much to the ſtudy of Philoſophy and Logick, that they became ſuch as are unuſeful for the edification of the Church, and in ſtead thereof, *Diſputatores rixoſi fiunt, cenſores ſuperbiſſimi, nihil aliud quàm diſputationes & rixas ſpirantes, omnia aliorum*, &c. *arrogantiſſimè conſentes, arrodentes, & malignè cavillantes, Scholarum & Eccleſiarum peſtes, ex quibus venenum altercationum, ſimultatum*, &c. *effunditur in Eccleſiam, i. e.* become brawling diſputers, proud cenſurers, breathing nothing but diſputes and janglings, moſt arrogantly cenſuring, ſnarling, and malignly cavilling at other mens labours, *niſi quod eorum capitibus gravidis admodulatum ſit preſcriptiſq; regulis congruant*, if they be not tuned to their heads great with Child, and congruent with their rules and precepts [of Art;] The very plagues of Schools and Churches, out of which the poyſon of brawlings, diviſions, and diſtractions is powred out into the Church: Having thus deſcribed them, hee thus concludes

in

in reference to the times past, *Equidem feliciter nunquam cessit Ecclesiæ, quando homines docti & studiosi, deserta simplicitate & puritati verbi dei, aliò converterunt oculos, neq; hos unicè in solum verbum Dei collimârunt, i.e.* Verily it hath never thrived well in the Church, when learned and studious men, forsaking the simplicity and purity of Gods word, have glanced their eyes on some other thing, and not fixed them only upon Gods word. And thus in reference to the times to come and present; *Si hodiè quoq; pergamus scripturis sanctis malè copulare philosophiam, & illas superstitiosè ad disputationes revocare, ac sub regulas cogere humanas, vel Artium; corrumpemus & ipsi in scholis, grandi cum Ecclesiæ detrimento, sinceritatem doctrinem Apostolicæ, i. e.* If in our times also we proceed evilly to couple together the Scriptures and Philosophy, and to call the Scriptures but outsidely or in a shew to our disputations, reducing them to the rules of men, and of the Arts, we also shall to the great disadvantage of the Church, corrupt the sincerity of Apostolical doctrine in the Schools. So much said *Bullinger*, a Classical Divine of his time neither without eminent learning, nor an enemie to it, for more than a 100 years sithence, in the last of those decads of Sermons which he set forth in print, *Anno* 1549. how long before the Edition thereof it was preached is uncertain. Yet gives after all this to humane literature its due praise: *Interim certum est* (saith he) *bonas Artes vel literas plurimum facere ad perspicuitatem & evidentiam; sed moderatè cum judicio, religiosè adhibitas, ut imperium relinquatur sacris literis, serviant autem omnes Artes exoticæ, i. e.* Mean while it must be granted that good Arts and Learning contribute much to the cleering and evidencing [of things] so that they be moderately, judiciously, and religiously made use of, and the Scripture be still left as Empress, and all extraneous Arts as handmaids (not to justle it aside, or sit in Chair with it, but) to do service to it. *Bulling. Ser. Decad. 5. Serm 10.*

In some things, in many things I grant the rules of these Arts, (when agreeing with Scripture) to be usefull to make out the absurdity or rationality of a mans reasoning about divine things: But except they could be proved universally, and in all parts perfect and indeficient, it is neither safe nor warrantable to yeeld up our faith and judgment in Gospel-matters to their determination.

This ingenuity therefore is to be attributed to M. *Baxter*, that he doth (though not professedly, yet actually) to this end come armed *a Cap ad Pe*, with this kind of learning, to destroy, not to maintain that sacred and fundamentall point of the Gospel, Justification of

meer grace. Yet to ſhew how much more confidence he hath in his Sophiſtry than in his Divinity, and to tell out aloud that he hath deſerved to have the title of *Subtiliſſimus* Doctor, which *Scotus* hitherto hath worn, hee hath affixed to the end of his Aporiſms a Table of Diſtinctions, to ſpeak out himſelf to all that will not otherwiſe ſee it, that he is whatſoever he is, Sophiſtry it ſelf, that diſtinctions flow from him as thick as Bees from the Hive. Only this one thing ſeems wanting in him, that he ſets not ſo much as an Aſterisk upon any of theſe diſtinctions, to tell us that either it is grounded upon the Scripture, or that it diſtinguiſheth him from a ſworn enemy to the Doctrine of Grace.

I do not expect to be free from cenſure for ſo much length in my diſcourſe upon this laſt ſubject, to ſhew the impotency and impropriety of ſecular learning to bear any authority in ſpiritual things. But I have to anſwer againſt ſuch cenſures, 1. That I have written therein nothing but words of ſoberneſs and truth; and I had rather with tediouſneſs make cleer a truth, than to drop errors with conciſeneſs. 2. That it was not againſt my purpoſe to be ſo large, nor yet beſide the mark aimed at. For ſhould I here put a period, Mr. *Baxters* falſities are more than half anſwered; becauſe that more than half of his Book conſiſteth of meerly ſophiſtical queſtions, definitions, arguments, evaſions, equivocations, diſtinctions and fallacies. In all which, if there be no force to prove or refute in Goſpel-matters; and that God is ſo farr from commanding or allowing ſuch ſlights in handling Goſpel-truths, as that he explodes, hates & curſeth the ſame (as hath been manifeſted) then the greater part of his work is hereby manifeſted to be vain. As for the reſidue of the Book, wherein he ſeems to confine himſelf to plain Scripture, he ſeldom and little meddles this way, but in confidence of his Sophiſtry that he hath at hand in ambuſh, to ſuccenturiate and help him at a dead lift, elſe all the fat will quickly be in the fire, his Scripturall reaſons for the moſt part cutting the throat of his own cauſ, and ſtoutly defending the truth which he oppugneth, as we ſhall find when I come to examine them.

One thing yet remaineth which I promiſed to premiſe, *viz.* what my intention is in excepting againſt Mr. *Baxters* book. This is not either to oppoſe him in all things which he hath written therein. For ſometimes he looks out thorow truths caſement, that we might take him fo a ſonn of truth, and the leſs ſuſpect him when he vends his falſe wares. In this caſe I will not jangle with him

him whether he ſpeaks truth of envy and ſubtlety, or of good will and ſincerity. Or 2. in all that ſhal ſeem to my judgment Heterodox in his Treatiſe, but only or mainly in thoſe things wherein he joyneth with the Romiſh Synagogue to maintain their damning doctrine, againſt the truth wch is and hath been profeſſed in all the Reformed Churches about Faith and Juſtification. Or 3. in every particular paſſage wherein he diſcovers himſelf in this point to be for Antichriſt againſt Chriſt; for ſometimes he delivers himſelf with ſuch ambiguities and æquivocations, like *Apollo* of old in his Oracles, that in pretence of another ſenſe of his words than the more Grammaticall and uſuall, he may leave a way of iſſue to himſelf, in caſe he cannot maintain his words in that ſenſe wherein he would be underſtood that he may deceive. Let it not therefore be thought all granted that ſhall not be here excepted againſt, and that I approve all whatſoever I do not oppugn. For method, I deſire no other may be expected from me, than to follow Maſter *Baxter* in order as he hath written, and to take up his Paradoxes and moſt profound and learned miſtakes as they fall from him, examining them, not by the rules of Sophiſtry, but by the touch-ſtone of the ſacred Word.

Theſe things thus premiſed, we are now to begin to examine the unſavory particulars occurring in the Book it ſelf.

Maſter


BRITISH MUSEUM
61
MAY

Mr. *Baxters* APHORISMS Exorized and Anthorized:

OR,

An Examination of, and Anſwer to, a Book written by Mr. *Rich. Baxter*, Teacher of the Church at *Kederminſter* in *Worceſterſhire*; ENTITULED,

Aphoriſms of Juſtification.

THE FIRST PART.

CHAP. I.

Arg. In which Mr. Baxters *Popiſh Doctrine of Implicit Faith is examined; and whether the people may admit Doctrine upon truſt from their Teachers.*

THE firſt paſſage wherein he ſheweth himſelf to ſmel of Popery in the point of Faith and Juſtification, is (before the work it ſelf) in the farewell of his Epiſtle to the Reader, *pag. antepenult.* of the Epiſtle, where he doth not obſcurely manifeſt himſelf to like well enough the Papiſts doctrine of *Implicit Faith*, and to wiſh it more favoured, and taken up at home among us. His words are theſe, ſpeaking to his Congregation,

Bax.

Bax. *Who I hope do underſtand that to take upon truſt from your teachers what you cannot yet reach to ſee in its own evidence, is leſs abſurd and more neceſſary than many do imagine.*

A very proper inſinuation to a people whom he would have to ſwallow ſuch Doctrines as in the following Treatiſe he offers to them to be ſwallowed. As far as he prevails, or prevails not with this inſinuation, ſo far he hath or hath not men his Diſciples. This is the very foundation of Antichriſts kingdom, the authority of men, as the foundation of Chriſts kingdom is the authority of the Scriptures. If Mr. *Baxter* can perſwade men to admit and ſuck in this Doctrine, his whole buſineſs is finiſhed, and all his ends attained. If they take upon truſt even fundamentall doctrines from their teachers, Let Mr. *Baxter* bring what doctrines he will with him of men and Devils, nothing ſhall be refuſed, all ſhall be taken upon his Credit. By this ſlight he knew the Pope had gathered, and many hundred years held under his vaſſallage in blind obedience many nations of the earth, therefore will not Mr. *Baxter* baulk it, when hee goes about to propagate the Popes doctrine among us.

But let us ſee what the Popiſh implicit faith is, and then compare Mr. *Baxter* with the Papiſts, to ſee whether there be not in both one mind and ſpirit. The Papiſts diſtinguiſh betwixt Faith and Faith, telling us there is an Explicit and there is an Implicit Faith. By the *Explicit Faith* they mean a cleer and diſtinct knowledg, apprehenſion, and believeng of all the Articles and Doctrines of faith which the holy Mother Church of *Rome* hath preſcribed to be received to ſalvation, and that not in a bunch only, but in particulars alſo. This Faith they hold needful and expedient in the Clergy (as they term their Prelats and Prieſts) who are to rule over, more than to teach the people. By the *Implicite Faith* they mean a generall and confuſed apprehenſion and believing of all that the Church hath commanded to be taught and believed; that it is all good and true, though they that ſo believe, know not in particular what the Church hath commanded, otherwiſe than they take it upon truſt of their Prieſts which tell them ſuch and ſuch things are commanded by the Church to be believed. This Faith they hold ſufficient for the Laity to ſalvation, to believe what the Church believeth and enjoyneth to be true, though they neither know what it is, nor are acquainted with one leaſt parcell of the word by

by which they may know it to be true, which they have ſo taken upon truſt to believe. By the Church they mean the Pope and his Clergy, by the Laity the people: So that by their Doctrine, if the Popes decree things in religion ſucceſſively never ſo contrary, and contradictory either to other, and the titular Clergy follow them, and go to Hell for it; yet the people have this one ſupereminent priviledg that their Implicit and Colliers faith ſaves them (as being ſtill the ſame and unchanged) that they believe as the Church believeth; though they know not either w^t the Church or what believing is, or what the things are wch the Church believeth.

Compare we now Mr. *Baxters* words with this popiſh doctrine, and ſee we if there be any difference. *I hope* (ſaith he) *you underſtand.* When Mr. *Baxter* ſaith *I hope*, we are not to doubt but a man of ſuch rare parts hath good grounds for his hope. He knew there was means uſed to make them underſtand, elſe would he not ſay, *I hope you underſtand*; and what means but teaching? and who ſhould teach them but Mr. *Baxter* their Teacher?

But what is it he hopes they underſtand? it followeth: *That to take upon the truſt of your Teachers, what you cannot yet ſee in its own evidence, is not*, &c. Here is the *Implicit Faith*, not to ground their opinions and belief in matters of ſalvation, upon the known word of God, but upon truſt from the Teachers, to believe becauſe their Teachers ſay they belive it. And what are the Teachers, but what in Popiſh phraſe is termed the Church, the Clergy, which is in their account at leaſt the Church repreſentative. And Mr. *Baxter* to decline envy uſeth the plurall number, *Teachers*, not (as I conceive) that the people of *Kederminſter* have more *Teachers* in ordinary beſides himſelf, for he names himſelf in the Title of the book *their unworthy Teacher*, not one of their *Teachers*, ſo that his purpoſe is to deliver a general rule for all Churches: His congragation to take upon truſt from him and other Congregations from their *Teachers*, what they themſelves cannot reach to ſee in its own evidence, *i. e.* ſuch doctrines as they themſelves by their own light and knowledg cannot tell whether they be white or black, true or falſe, from Heaven or from Hell. And to do this, *is leſſe abſurd and more neceſſary then many imagin.* Mr. *Baxter* is ſcarce yet beginning to diſcover himſelf, therefore we have yet *Bona Verba* from him, we hear him ſpeaking modeſtly; afterward *vires acquirit eundo*, we ſhall when once he is hot in his diſcourſe hear him ſpeak in the full of the mouth; here only he ſaith *leſs abſurd and more neceſſary than ſome imagine.*

gin. But who knows not his meaning to be, that for the people thus to pin their *Faith* to the sleeves of their *Teachers*, specially to such profound *Teachers* as Mr. *Baxter*, is so far from being absurd as that it is necessary (I suppose he meaneth to salvation) though some imagine otherwise.

Here I would demand (not of Mr. *Baxter*, for I desire not familiarity with him while such an *Aphorist*) but of any knowing man indulgent to him, when he saith, *less absurd and more necessary, than some imagine*; whom can he mean by those *some*, but the Protestant Churches and Divines, who at all times with one consent have cryed out against the absurdity of this doctrine, in their disputations against the Papists? And if so, what doth he less therein than pronounce the Popish Doctrine herein necessary, and the doctrine of all the Protestants in opposition to it, a meer imagination?

But it may be objected, that the Papists lay down this doctrine of *Implicit Faith*, or believing upon the authority of the Church, or their Teachers, for a continual rule to the people. But Mr. *Baxter* proposeth it but as a temporary rule, useful only for a season. Therefore the difference between him and them is considerable: For so much may be gathered from Mr. *Baxters* words, to take upon trust from your *Teachers*, what you cannot *Yet reach to see in its own Evidence.* It is but while they are *yet* weak, while they cannot *yet* reach, *&c.* But when once they are strengthened, and have attained to see truths in their own evidence, thenceforth they are to take up such doctrines upon their own evidence, not upon trust from their *Teachers* any longer.

I answer, This difference is but supposed, not reall. For if we compare his words here with that which he hath written in the next Section of this Epistle before, and with the whole frame and current of of his disputes, throughout his whole book, we shal find that he doth equally with the Papists labour to settle the people in an *implicit faith* to believe as the Church believeth still. For in the former Sect. he that knoweth best his own congregation, acknowledgeth it to *be in the number of those, the greatest part whereof is uncapable of understanding such controverted points as are treated of in his book.* He saith not only that they understand them not, but also denyeth them to be in a capacity to be brought to the understanding of them, *viz.* in their own evidence, therefore they must still hold them upon trust from their *Teachers.*

Besides, if we look to the frame of his Disputes in this Treatise, we

we shall find him concurring with the Papists, in his indeavours to keep the people in a perpetuall incapacity to understand such Doctrines in their own evidence. For what else can he mean by seeing a point of divine doctrine in its own evidence, but one of these two things, to see it in the evidence and cleer testimony of the word by which God hath set it forth? or to see it in the evidence of Sophistical learning and disputes, by which Mr. *Baxter* and the Sophisters whom he followeth, pretend themselves to set it forth? But by neither of these will Mr. *Baxter* or the Popish Sophisters (if they can hinder it) suffer the vulgar people to know any Evangelicall truth in its own evidence. Not by the evidence of the Scriptures, by which God hath cleered up, and so plainly revealed the fundamental truths of salvation, that even babes and sucklings may in good measure comprehend them, *Mat.* 11.25. 1 *Cor.* 1.26. For here with his Masters the Romish Sophisters, hee raiseth vain and distracting questions, making difficulties where the wisedom of God hath left none, and so puzling weak and tender consciences, that in what before they had attained by the pure and simple light of the word, seeing now such a thick fogg of doubts interposed, they think themselves to have lost what light once they had, and so sink into sadness and despair, concluding it utterly unattainable. What zeal Mr. *Baxter* hath thus not only to match, but also to exceed all the locusts of *Rome* in darkning such truths as Christ hath in Scripture left cleer and open to all, shining in the very Sun-beams of the Gospel, we shall find in examining the following parts of his Treatise. So that in this respect he hinders, as much as in him lyeth, his *Kederminsterians* from seeing the truth of Christ in its own evidence.

Nor by the latter (Mr. *Baxters* sophistical way of quenching under a pretence of confirming Gospel-truth) can the vulgar ever attain to know them in their own evidences, not only because this humane Learning hath no power to search into them, but also because it is not to be expected that illiterate men should ever attain any depth in this learning. For if it be true what is generally held by Mr. *Baxter* and his side, that without great acquaintance with school-learning, the marrow of Divinity can never be effectually pierced into; and what a great Scholler once told *Erasmus*, that one of these School-Doctors *John Scotus*, can in no wise be understood under nine years study at the least; and what a 3d affirmeth, that a man must have *Aristotles Metaphysicks ad unguem*, before he can be ca-

pable of underſtanding one ſentence of *Scotus*; Farewell then all hope of ſaving knowledg ever to be attained by unſcotified miſerable idiots, in its own evidence, or by the Miniſteriall help of ſuch Teachers as have crept here below upon the Doctrine of Chriſt his Prophets and Apoſtles, and not had ſo much time and patience as Mr. *Baxter* hath beſtowed in the ſublimated ſtudy of *Ariſtotle*, *Scotus*, and their fellows.

But what if Mr. *Baxter* herein ſpeak the ſame things (may ſome ſay) with the Church of *Rome*, and the ſame in oppoſition to the judgment of all the Reformed Churches, yet this doth not certainly prove that it is ſavouring of error which he here delivereth, except it be manifeſted that he ſpeaketh againſt the Scriptures. Doth the word any where forbid us to take up points of Faith on the credit of our Teachers, though we underſtand not the points which they teach, much leſs can produce any Scriptures ſurely and ſoundly to confirm them?

I anſwer, that the Scriptures are very full and punctuall againſt taking upon truſt of meer men any doctrine to be believed to ſalvation. *Be not ye called Maſters, for one is your Maſter, even Chriſt*, Mat. 23.10. *q. d.* Dare not any of you to ſuffer any to take up matters in Religion upon your truſt or authority? For there is but one unerring Mr. whoſe authority is authentick, Chriſt Jeſus. *If Paul or an Angell from heaven preach any other Goſpel to you*, &c. *let him be accurſed*, Gal. 1. 8. therefore not truſted. *Prove all things, hold faſt that which is good*, 1 Theſ. 5. 21. *Believe not every Spirit, but try the ſpirits whether they be of God: For many falſe Prophets are gone forth into the world*, 1 Joh. 4. 1. When the Holy Ghoſt ſaith, *Prove all*, *Try all*, he implyedly forbids to take up any thing on truſt from men. *My ſheep hear my voyce, the voyce of a ſtranger they will not hear, for they know not*, *i. e.* own not the voyce of ſtrangers, *Joh.* 10. 4, 5, 27. They know and own the voyce of Chriſt alone: If any preach with another voyce, another doctrine than that which is originally from Chriſt, they fly from him, explode him. Here is nothing taken upon truſt but from Chriſt himſelf. *They are built upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apoſtles, Jeſus Chriſt being the head corner-ſtone*, Eph. 2. 20. A more noble foundation than the truſt and authority of men.

I might annex many like teſtimonies of divine Scripture to the ſame purpoſe, but to what purpoſe? They are Deceivers, ſuch as the Apoſtle numbreth among *grievous wolves, ſpeakers of perverſe things*,

things, i. e. perverters of the Goſpel of Chriſt, that *ſeeke to draw Diſciples after them, i. e.* to ſettle men in a Faith upon the authority of their learning, wiſedom, and holineſs, *Acts* 20. 29, 30. But Mr *Baxter* and his peers are neceſſitated thus to do, if in teaching ſuch doctrines they will draw after them Diſciples; For being deſtitute of the authority of God and his word, if they ſhould not urge men to a credulity upon the authority of men, their doctrine would be hiſſed at as having no authority.

To conclude then; the doctrine which Mr. *Baxter* here more than obſcurely holds forth is,

1 Againſt Chriſt, and all the Reformed Churches which condemn it, borrowed of, and owned by the apoſtatized Synagogue of *Rome* only.

2 Againſt the Scripture, as hath been manifeſted.

3 It is a doctrine that brings with it an unſetledneſs and inſtability in Faith and Religion. Whoſoever takes it up from Mr. *Baxters* credit, muſt be always learning, and never know, be whirled hither and thither with doubts and uncertainties, without any firm ſtation, never attaining reſt. For he that taketh upon truſt from his *Teachers* what to believe and do to be ſaved, will one day be of *Paul*, another of *Apollo*, and a third of *Cephas*, as his fancy tels him, this or that *Teacher* is moſt worthy to be truſted. In great probability Mr. *Baxters* predeceſſor taught not the ſame Juſtification with Mr. *Baxter*, and he that ſhall ſucceed him will hold out the ſame grounds and way of juſtification with Chriſt and his Apoſtles which Mr. *Baxter* declineth. And I know not but either of them may be as worthy of Truſt as himſelf. In what a maze muſt that people then be led, by what turnings and returnings muſt they be dragged forward and backward, who are taught to take up doctrines on the truſt of their Teachers? what joy in believing can they ever have, whoſe rule in believing is to be never ſetled in their faith, but to be ſtill wavering? His Diſciples muſt needs be meer weather-cocks, *toſſed to and fro with every wind of doctrine, by the ſlight of men, and cunning craftineſſe, whereby they lay in wait to deceive*, Eph. 4. 14.

4 It is a doctrine that makes way for all Hereſie, Blaſphemy, and Impiety into the hearts of the people. For when Religion is taken upon truſt from the Teachers, Satan will transform himſelf into an Angel of light, and his Miniſters themſelves into Miniſters of Righteouſneſs, to gain credit and opinion of wiſdom and holineſs above

above others among the people, that upon their truſt at laſt the people may ſwallow all falſhoods under the name of Truth, whatſoever they ſhall commend to them, 2 *Cor.* 11. 13—15. See whither the *Galathians* were carryed by taking upon truſt from their ſeemingly Angelical Teachers doctrines of faith. *Chriſt is become of no effect to you, ye are falu from grace,* ſaith the Apoſtle to them, *Gal.* 5. 4. Surely the doctrine of Mr. *Baxter* is the ſame in generall and ſubſtance, with theirs that corrupted and ſeduced *Galatia.* The Lord avert the like ſucceſs from *Kedermin-ſter.*

5 It is a Doctrine pernicious in it ſelf, and brings a curſe upon them that receive it in the very receiving of it. For *curſed is man that truſteth in man, and maketh fleſh his arm, whoſe heart departeth from the Lord,* Jer. 17. 5. If ſo in earthly, much more in ſpirituall things. So much of this point, in which having found what Mr. *Baxter* is before his entrance upon the bulk of his work, we may eaſily conjecture what a one we ſhall find him, being entred.

Chap. II.

Mr. Baxters *Sophiſticall way and Method of diſpute to obſcure and not to cleer the truths of the Goſpel, diſcovered: And that therein he imitates the Papiſts.*

IN the former Chapter we have found Mr. *Baxter* before his entrance upon his Treatiſe, ſomewhat diſcovering with whom he joyns in opinion, ſo far that we may diſcern and gueſs *ex ungue leonem,* by one little piece of the man, what he is in his whole bulk and frame. It contents him not to be one and the ſame with the Papiſts in his judgment, but that he will next alſo diſcover himſelf to be the ſame with them in their ſlights and artifice, to bring all others into the ſame judgment and opinion with them. That generation of the Popiſh Schoolmen are fitly likened by Sir *Francis Bacon,* in his *Advancement of learning,* to Spiders, which ſpin out their webbs out of their own bowels. So theſe ſpinn all their doctrines in religion out of their own brains, their own reaſon, naming Chriſt ſometimes therein, but rather hiding and darkning the authority of his word, than following it as their leading threed in all their doctrines. All their writings about Evangelicall and ſaving points of knowledg, are but as ſo many webs of their fancy

to catch and carry away from the purity of Chriſts Goſpel; not ſo many well-ordered threeds of ſacred Scriptures to guide and bring us to him. Who is there of all that have but curſorily read their works, that finds them not conſiſting of large heaps of needleſs and ſuperfluous queſtions, to obſcure the light of the word, and to bring all to the tryall of reaſon, yea ſophiſticall and ſophiſticated reaſon, ſurmounting the reaſon and capacity of the people to comprehend? And theſe queſtions which they ſpin and ſpit out by dozens, yea hundreds & thouſands, as they are moſtly ſuperfluous, vain, uſeleſs, and many of them preſumptuouſly and arrogantly propoſed, about things which the Lord hath kept ſecret in his own boſom, not revealing them by his word: ſo are they oft no leſs peremptorily and audaciouſly by theſe men anſwered and determined out of their Philoſophicall and Metaphyſicall fancies, without one particle of the word to ground their determinations upon. Thus by their queſtionary ſophiſtry they have both obſcured, if not totally quenched all true Divinity, *i. e.* the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and have foyſted in a confuſed *Chaos* of titular Divinity, that hath nothing of light or life in it, ſuch as the Scripture owns not, from their own reaſon.

Compare we now Mr. *Baxter* with theſe, to ſee whether as the Apoſtle calleth *Timothy his own*, or his *naturall ſon in the faith*, 1 Tim. 1. 2. becauſe he walked directly after him in the ſteps of his faith: ſo Mr. *Baxter* doth not alſo declare himſelf the *own and naturall ſonn of theſe ſophiſters*, by walking directly after them in the ſteps of their cunning and ſubtlety to deſtroy the Faith. The Poets feigned that *Minerva* was begotten and born of *Jupiters* brain, becauſe ſhe was all wiſedom it ſelf. And I think Mr. *Baxter* would be offended, if I ſhould be denyed that all the quintiſſence of ſophiſticall learning that hath been in all the brains of all the Schoolmen and Jeſuits, were not ſo extracted from them, as to have its reſidency now in his. He was (as far as I can uuderſtand) born and brought up in the Proteſtant Church within this nation, as *Caſtor*, *Pollux*, &c. were in the houſe of *Leda*; but by a new and ſtrange generation or adoption of eggs layd by theſe Serpents, he diſcovers himſelf now in a manner to be wholly theirs: ſo fully doth he reſemble, yea paralell them, that *unum nôris*, *omnes nôris*; you may read in him alone, the *Genius* and the *Craft* of them all. Attend we els to his own words in his explication of his 7th Theſis, *pag.* 25, *&c.* All that he hath written before, I paſſe by without exception againſt it, *pag.* 19.

19. he layeth down his 7. Aphoriſm in theſe words:

Bax. *Jeſus Chriſt, at the will of his Father, and upon his own will, being perfectly furniſhed for this work, with a Divine power and perſonall Rigteouſneſs, firſt undertook, and afterward diſcharged this debt* [viz. *mans debt to God*] *by ſuffering what the Law did threaten, and the offender himſelf was unable to bear.*

To this as to the reſt he addeth that which he calleth an Explication, *i.e.* an Expoſition, explainning or making plain of the Aphoriſm or point ſo laid. Let us trace him how now he makes it plain, beginning at the 25. p. before mentioned. I ſhould be too large to write all his words, yet ſhall not wrong him by writing any ſave his own words, or the very ſubſtance of them.

Bax. *Here we are caſt upon many and weighty and very difficult queſtions.* 1 *Whether Chriſt did diſcharge this debt by way of ſolution, or by way of ſatisfaction?* 2 *Whether in his ſuffering and our eſcape, the threatning of the Law was executed, or diſpenſed with?* 3 *And if diſpenſed with, how it can ſtand with the truth and juſtice of God?* 4 *And whether ſinners may thence be encouraged to conceive ſome hope of a relaxation of the threatnings in the Goſpell?* 5 *And whether the faithfull may not fear leſt God may relax a promiſe as well as a threatning?* 6 *And whether if the Law be relaxable, God might not have releaſed his Sonn from the ſuffering, rather then to have put him to ſo great torment, and to have freely pardoned the offenders?* *And* p. 27. *The reſolving of the firſt queſtion depends upon the reſolving of two other queſtions, both great and difficult* 1 *What it was which the* Law *did threaten?* 2 *What it was that Chriſt did ſuffer? Various are the judgments of* * *Divines about the former,* &c. 1 *Whether* Adams *ſoule and body ſhould have been annihilated and deſtroyed, ſo as to become inſenſible?* 2 *Or whether his ſoule ſhould have been immediately ſeparated from his body, as ours are by death, and ſo be the only ſufferer of the pain?* 3 *Or if ſo, whether there ſhould have been any reſurrection of the body, after any ſpace of time, that ſo it might ſuffer as well as the ſoul?* 4 *Or whether ſoul and body without ſeparation ſhould have gone down quick into hell, or into any place or ſtate of torment ſhort of hell?* 5 *Or whether both ſhould have lived a curſed life on earth, through everlaſting, in excluſion from Paradiſe, ſeparation from Gods favour and gracious preſence, loſs of his image,* &c. 6 *Or whether he ſhould have lived ſuch a miſerable life for a ſeaſon,*

*He means the Popiſh Doctors ſpecially, for they with him are the Divines.

and then be annihilated or deſtroyed? 7 And if ſo, whether his miſery on earth ſhould have been more than men do now endure? And the more importance are theſe queſtions of, becauſe of ſome others that depend upon them: As 1. *What death it was that Chriſt redeemed us from? 2 And what death it is that periſhing Infants dye, or that our guilt in the firſt tranſgreſſion doth procure? For it being a ſinn againſt the firſt covenant only, will be puniſhed with no other death than that which is threatned in that Covenant. And* pag. 31. *Beſides it is needfull to know what life was the reward of that Covenant, that we might know what death was the penalty* [*and this alſo comes into queſtion about the reward*] *whether (if he had not fallen) he ſhould after a ſeaſon have been tranſlated into heaven without death, as* Enoch *and* Elijah, *or whether he ſhould have lived for ever in this terreſtriall Paradiſe without addition of further bliſs to that which he had at his firſt Creation?* And as touching the death which Chriſt ſuffered, whether it were the ſame that was threatned to *Adam?* Pa. 33. *If we take the threatning at its full extent, as it expreſſeth not only the penalty, but alſo its proper ſubject and its circumſtances, then it is undenyable that Chriſt did not ſuffer the ſame that was threatned. For the Law threatned the death of the offender, but Chriſt was not the offender.* Adam *ſhould have ſuffered for ever, but ſo did not Chriſt.* Adam *did dye ſpiritually by being forſaken of God, in regard of holineſs, as well as in regard of comfort, and ſo was deprived at leaſt of the chief part of his image, ſo was not Chrſt.*

Yet [neither is this certain that Chriſts death was not the ſame, &c. for] *It is diſputable whether theſe two laſt were directly contained in threatning or not? whether the threatning were not fully executed in* Adams *death, and the eternity of it were not accidentall, even a neceſſary conſequent of* Adams *diſability to overcome death, and deliver himſelf, which God was not bound to do? And whether the loſs of Gods image were part of the death threatned, or rather the effect of our ſin only, executed by our ſelves and not by God? whether God did take away his image, or man did thruſt it away?*

Admirable profoundneſs and learning! but after all this ſtirr, and ſuch egregiouſly deep ſpeculations as preparatories to the determining of the firſt queſtion, whether Chriſt did diſcharge our debt by way of ſolution, or by way of ſatisfaction? how doth he at length determine it?

Bax. P. 29, & 30. *Much may be ſaid, this ſeemeth, that is unlikely, one thing probable, another poſſible: But for a finall concluſion,* p. 31. *It is hard to conclude peremptorily* [*any thing*] *in ſo obſcure a caſe.*

And ſo he leaves us ſo wiſe, as if he had ſlept and ſaid nothing. But afterwards recalling himſelf, though he can conclude nothing as to the forementioned particular preparatories to the determination of the queſtion; yet p. 35. to the ſubſtance of it in generall he thus anſwereth.

Bax. *I canclude then, that in regard of the proper penalty, Chriſt did ſuffer a pain and penalty of the ſame ſort, and of equall weight with that threatned; but yet becauſe it was not in all reſpects the ſame, it was rather ſatisfaction than the payment of the proper debt, being ſuch a payment as God might have choſen to accept.*

I liſt not to quarrel with him about the concluſion, it being not a point mainly controverted between us and the Papiſts. Only who ſees not that he might as eaſily have thus concluded, without medling with ſo many frivolous and arrogant queſtions, leaving them where he found them, as not giving the leaſt ſulture to ſuch a concluſion? And when he hath thus determined the queſtion, they that lock up to themſelves his Concluſion as a treaſure, ſhall gaine ſo much by it as he that rejoyceth of a chip in his pottage. Poſſibly it may do no hurt, but certainly it will do no good to ſalvation.

But the anſwer to the ſecond queſtion comes without the help or puſh of a leaver to heave it after, *viz.* whether the threatning was executed, or relaxed and diſpenſed with?

B. *The anſwer to this is plain in the Anſwer to the former,* p. 35.

Both alike; for were it worth the ſcanning, we ſhould find both either anſwered or unanſwered: and the things ſearched after, no leſs plain to be ſeen and taken up than a needle in a bottle of hay. And ſo much M. *Baxter* ſeeth, for he comes after, with his diſtinction.

B. *In regard of the meer weight of puniſhment conſidered as abſtracted from perſon and duration, it was executed,* [and to avoid the miſtake of the Printer, I conceive it ſhould be] *not relaxed. Yet taking the threatning entirely as it was given out, and we muſt ſay* [*viz.*

[*viz.* if we ſay after Mr. *Baxter*] *it was diſpenſed with, for mankind doth not ſuffer all that was threatned.*

When I attain the meaning of the words, I ſhall be able to judg of the ſtrength of the reaſon therein contained. And 2ly he brings in a doubt, *viz.*

B. *If the death threatned did conſiſt in our preſent miſeries, and temporall death only, then the anſwer muſt be recanted,* &c.

And a little further Conference with theſe Diviners rather than Divines (it ſeemeth) would make him of their minds. And ſo the anſwer to the queſtion depends upon ifs, if Mr. *Baxter* change his mind, his anſwer muſt fall after him. In the mean while the third queſtion muſt depend upon the uncertain anſwer to the ſecond.

B. *If the threat be diſpenſed with, how it can ſtand with the truth and juſtice of God ſo to diſpenſe with it?*

Lo the anſwer to the former queſtion is ſtuck ſo deep in the mire, that the beſt Team in Worceſterſhire cannot draw it out. Nevertheleſs ſuch an artizan is Mr. *Baxter*, that with the ſpell of a few diſtinctions, he doth it while a man would wipe his mouth, thus.

B. *Concerning the juſtice of God the queſtion is not difficult, and I ſhall ſay nothing to that.*

See, he is half out of the labyrinth already, and never moves a finger for it. O rare dexterity! It coſts a little more labour to get free from the other half, and thus de doth it.

B. *The queſtion is, how to reconcile this diſpenſation with Gods truth? Here you muſt diſtinguiſh, 1. Betwixt the letter of the Law and the ſenſe. 2. Betwixt the Law and the end of the Law. 3. Between a threat with exception, either expreſſed or reſerved, and that which hath no exception. 4. Between a threatning which only expreſſeth the deſert of the ſinn, and what puniſhment is due, and ſo falleth under the will of precept; and that which alſo intendeth the certain prediction of event, and ſo falleth under the will of purpoſe alſo.*

And now I Anſwer.

1. The end of the Law is the Law, and that being the manifeſtation of Gods juſtice, and hatred of ſin, &c. was fulfilled,

and therefore the Law was fulfilled [a]. 2. Most think that the threatning had this reserved exception. *Thou shalt dye, i. e.* by thy self or thy surety: and though it be sinfull for man to speak with mentall reservations, when he pretends to reveal his mind, yet not in God, because as he is subject to no law, so he is not bound to reveal to us all his mind, nor doth he indeed pretend any such thing. 3. So that the sense of the same is fulfilled. 4. But the special answer that I give is this, when threatnings are meerly parts of the Law, and not also predictions of the event, and discoveries of Gods purpose thereabouts, then they may be dispensed with without any breach of truth. For as when God saith, *Thou shalt not eat of the tree,* &c. the meaning is only, It is thy duty not to eat, and not eventually that he should not eat. So when he saith, *Thou shalt dye the death*, the meaning is, Death shall be the due reward of thy sin, and so may be inflicted for it at my pleasure; and not that he should certainly suffer it in the event [b].

[a] Let the Judg of assizes then chide, and lay by the feet a murtherer for an hour, declaring therby his justice and hatred of the offece. M. *Baxter* must conclude him to be a just Judg, & to have fulfilled the Law, if hereupon he forth-with discharge him.

[b] This Doctrine wipes off all feare from scandalous sinners having this plea put into their mouth by Mr. *Baxter*: God hath said, thou shalt not so offend but his meaning is not that I should eventually abstain, and hath said, Thou shalt be condemned, not meaning eventually to execute it. *Ergo*, I may go on in sin without fear.

Read the rest he that loves it, I have enough even to nauseousness. What Jesuite reading this will not cry out, *O delicatum animulum*, a babe of the same mould with the Scholastick Doctors of the holy mother Church, licked by them Bear like into their own form. If *Scotus* could now awake to see how this man hath improved and perfected his method in disputing, it is a question whether envy or joy would more work in him. It was his rule to evidence *ignotum per ignotius*, an obscure point by that which is more obscure. This man hath proceeded further, to illustrate and prove *Notissima, per ignotissima,* that which is most cleer of it self, by that which is as dark as darkness it self. For what more evident and plain than the Aporism or Doctrine which he doth here pretendedly explain? but the explication it self a dark labyrinth. Let *Aquinas* now and his *Cajetan* riding him with his Comments, both together, yea the whole rabble of the Scholasticks appear, and shew whether among them all there be any that in so short a room and narrow a compass couched together so many subtle questions, backed them with so many dainty distinctions, and then answered them with so much profoundness as this one Mr. *Baxter*? Oh happy

py *Kederminſterians* that have attained ſuch an Expounder and Explainer of ſacred things, whom when they have heard and read, if they attend exactly to him, what they ſaw before cleerly of Chriſt, they ſhall ſo ſee no more! How can they ever ſtray which have ſuch a leader guiding them with a dark Lanthorn? By that time that Maſter *Baxter* hath ſo fully and learnedly explained all other doctrines of the Goſpel to them as he hath this Aphoriſm, they ſhall be able to ſee ſo farr into the myſteries of Chriſt, as they can kenn at Sea thorow a planck ſix inches thick.

Nevertheleſs Mr. *Baxter* (I ſuppoſe will not deny but that he hath left unto others (if there be any that have ſo much wantonneſs in the quirpo of their fancies, and ſuch profligated conſciences, that they dare to play with ſacred things) a power to derive from the Schoolmen whom he followeth, ſo many pertinent or impertinent queſtions, ſo many vain and ſophiſticall diſtinctions, that their gleaning ſhall match his vintage; and with theſe may ſtand in oppoſition to Mr. *Baxter* ſo ſtoutly, that they may conclude in all things no leſs uncertainly than himſelf: ſo that after many and long diſputes in this Scholaſtick way, wholly in contradiction to him, they may prove themſelves to be as far eſtranged from the plainneſs and ſimplicity of the Goſpel, as himſelf ſeems ambitious to be found.

Chap. III.

Queries about this queſtionary and diſtinctionary way of Diſpute, too much uſed by Mr. Baxter, *whether it be warrantable, and not manifoldly hurtfull. To which is added a brief examination of what Mr.* Baxter *hath of Chriſts Active and Paſſive righteouſneſs.*

BUt having ſpoken ſomewhat largely of this kind of learning in the Preface to prevent length and tediouſneſs in the following diſcourſe, I ſhall here only oppoſe ſome queſtions to his queſtions, and paſs away. And in theſe queſtions I ſhall be an appealer to Mr. *Baxters* conſcience only.

1. Whether he hath learned this Art of ſubtle, ſuperfluous, and unſcriptural queſtions and diſtinctions to explain holy and evangelicall

gicall dioctrines, from the Lord Chriſt or his Apoſtles, or from any ſolid, humble, and orthodox Divines ancient or modern? and not wholly from the Popiſh Doctors and their adherents, *Grotius*, *Socinus*, *Arminius*, and their Diſciples?

2. Whether in this queſtionary and diſtinctionary way of diſpute, his purpoſe be not contrary to what he pretends (the explication of Divine truth) even the ſame with the Papiſts whom he followeth, to dim the truth, that having left it in a miſt, he may take the advantage to foyſt upon mens conſciences the fancies and errors of his own brain under the name of truth?

3. Whether it be not intolerable arrogance and preſumption againſt the *Moſt High God*, not to reſt contented with that which he hath revealed by his word, but audaciouſly to ſearch into his ſecrets which he hath kept hidden in his own boſom? himſelf acknowledging that the H: G: ſpeaketh in Scripture very ſparingly (*i. e.* indeed not at all) of many things that he here hath ſo peremptorily queſtioned and diſputed of, yet hath the front from ſophiſticated reaſon to argue and determine of them. Is not this proudly to pry into the Ark of Gods preſence, and uncalled, to make himſelf of Gods Cauncell? If the Lord Jeſus in a way of rebuke tells his Diſciples, *It is not for them* (though deputed to a greater and higher charge than Mr. *Baxter*) *to know the times and ſeaſons which the Father hath put in his own power*, when they ſought (not from their Rabbies, nor from pur-blind reaſon, nor from their own deceitfull brains, but) from the oracle of Chriſts lips, *when the kingdom ſhould be reſtored to Iſrael*; under what rebuke lies Mr. *Baxter* and his fellows, which audaciouſly ſearch after the things which the Father hath put in his own power, to be there hidden untill he ſhall be pleaſed to reveal them, and them to ſearch after, not from the lips of Chriſt, but from their own mad reaſon and reaſonings? Is not this knwledg a forbidden fruit? and will not the luſting after it bring vengeance?

4. Whether this were not the ſin of *Elimas the ſorcerer*, *who being full of ſubtlety and miſchief*, *perverted the right wayes of the Lord*, Act. 13. 10. What were the right ways of the Lord, but the pure Goſpel which the Apoſtle had preached in its ſimplicity and plainneſs? And what was *Elimas* his perverting thereof, but the uſe of his ſubtlety and miſchief, in his diſputes to make that which in *Pauls* preaching was plain, right and ſtraight, to ſeem abſurd, abſtruſe and crooked? doth Mr. *Baxter* either here or throughout his whole book

book ceaſe to uſe the like ſubtlety? what more plain and ſtreight than the Theſis or point here laid down by himſelf? or what is his endeavour in his explication thereof, but with his ſubtle queſtions and diſtinctions to leave ſo crooked and ſo manifold windings upon it, that he makes it a very Labyrinth; that without his Clew, or with it, there is ſcarce a poſſibility of paſſage in ſafety thorow it? And the like operations of his we ſhall find every where in this book.

5. Whether he be not in ſuch his diſputes captious of praiſe to himſelf, ſeeking his own, not Gods glory? and as it tickled the ear of *Demoſthenes* to hear the people whiſpering, yonder comes *the eloquent Demoſthenes*: So whether he hath not an itching ambition to be accounted and called *the profound and learned Mr.* Baxter, the great Reader, the man of deepeſt ſpeculations and matchleſs comprehenſions? I do but appeal to his Conſcience. For my part I cannot with my dull apprehenſion as much as conjecture, what els he can in ſome paſſages of this work aim at in uſing ſo much ſophiſtry, when there is no need of it, neither doth it as farr as I can ſee, any whit further him to the end at which he driveth, unleſs it be his own praiſe among unſpirituall men, and to make his authority the greater to deceive.

6. Whether he offends not here and elſewhere againſt the rule of the Apoſtle who enjoyneth upon all to take heed of *high thoughts of themſelves, and to be wiſe to ſobriety*, Rom. 12. 3. *i. e.* not to mount above their reach and meaſure. And what ſhall be accounted a wiſedom without and againſt ſobriety, if not that which intrudeth it ſelf into the things of God which it hath pleaſed him not to reveal, pretending an ability with the key of ſecular learning to unlock the Cabinet of Cods Counſells to which the moſt glorious Angels never dared to approach? The Chriſtian Spirit is the meek and modeſt Spirit, where the Scripture is not the inſtructor, contents it ſelf to be ignorant, concluding with *Tertullian*, *Quis revelabit quod Deus texit? unde ſciſcitandum eſt? unde & ignorare tutiſſimum eſt. Præſtat per Deum neſcire quia non Revelaverit, quam per hominem ſcire, quia ipſe preſumpſerit*, i. e. Who ſhall reveal what God hath covered? whence [in ſuch caſe] ſhall we make enquiry? vea hence to be ignorant is moſt ſafe. It is better not to know by [the will of] God, becauſe he hath not revealed it, than [to ſeem] to know by man becauſe he hath preſumed. *Tert. lib. de Anima fere in Principio.*

7. Whether he doth not croſs another precept of the Apoſtle, 1 *Tim.*

Tim. 6.20. peculiarly appropriated to all Miniſters under the name and perſon of *Timothy*? O *Timothy*, keep that which is committed to thy truſt, avoyding prophane and vain bablings, and oppoſitions of ſcience falſly ſo called. He cannot, none can deny the thing committed to *Timothies* truſt, to be the Goſpel in its verity, purity, and ſimplicity. This therefore he is charged to keep, to make it his buſineſs to preſerve it alive and inviolated within him, to keep and hold himſelf cloſely to it, without deviating to any other ſtudies as helpfull to ſalvation. Therefore to avoid vain bablings and oppoſitions of ſcience falſly ſo called. Neither will Mr. *Baxter* deny, and all Commentators affirm the thing to be avoyded here, to be ſophiſticall and philoſophical diſputes; which if intermixed with the Doctrine of the Goſpel, are here termed prophane and vain babling, which hath the name and opinion of ſcience or wiſdom in the opinion of men, but is falſly ſo called and reputed. Doth not Mr. *Baxter* here ſee himſelf ſet aſide by the Holy Ghoſt for a prophane and vain babler? and his learning and wiſdom exploded as ſhady and falſe, having nothing of ſubſtance and truth in it?

8. Whether he doth not by this way of diſputing (as much as in him is) uncanonize and make void the word? For if he hold with the Apoſtle that the *holy Scripture is ſufficient and able to make men wiſe to ſalvation through faith which is in Chriſt Jeſus*, 2 Tim. 3. 15. why doth he not ſtick to it? what els doth his ſo oft and foul digreſſions from it, to fetch ayd from his ſophiſtry, but argue that he holds the Scripture to be invalid to ſave, and that there is either an equall or greater power in his ſophiſtry to make men wiſe and perfect to ſalvation?

9. Whether it doth not bewray his Cauſe to be naught, that he knows it to be naught, therfore ſeeks to bear it up with ſuch ſlights & feats as a good Cauſe needeth not? When we ſee a houſe propped up on every ſide, at every end with poſts, ſtakes and pillars, who concludes not, ſurely it is a ruinous and rotten building that needs ſo many ſupporters? It is not for the maintenance of the Aphoriſm or Doctrine which Mr. *Baxter* doth here pretendedly explicate, that he doth tye knots and unty them, bind and looſe with ſuch a hurry of queſtions and diſtinctions. This doctrine ſtands firm enough upon its own bottom. Conſcious he is therefore of a rotten building, which he means in the following part of this Treatiſe, to erect, and therefore furniſheth himſelf with ſo many poſts

poſts and ſtakes to under-prop it. It is well obſerved by Mr. *Pemble* out of *Eraſmus*, *Malè res agitur ubi opus eſt tot remedijs.* It is a certain ſign of an untrue opinion when it muſt be bolſtered up with ſo many diſtinctions. And if the Cauſe be naught, and the defender know it, yet perſiſts to defend it, then are the Cauſe and the man both alike. *Pemb. of Juſtif. Sect. 2. Cap. 1 p. 37.*

10. Whether this kind of Argumentation doth not declare Mr. *Baxter* to be of another ſpirit from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, Chriſt came into the world to *preach the Goſpel to the poor*, Lu. 4. 18. *to give ſight to the blind, that they which ſee not might ſee*, Joh. 9. 39. *And Paul diſcended low nurſlike with flattering ſpeech unto the weak as to babes in Chriſt, feeding them with milk* and not with meat, untill they became capable to digeſt it, 1 *Cor.* 2. 1.---4 & 3. 1, 2. likewiſe alſo the reſt of the Apoſtles. But this man ſoareth on high unto the upmoſt region of the Airy element, above the kenn and reach of weak Chriſtians, ſuch as he acknowledgeth them (for the greateſt part to be) for whoſe ſake chiefly he wrote this, ſpeaking not to the comprehenſion of any, ſave of ſuch windy ones as himſelf, at leaſt to the delight of no other; ſo elevated ſeems he with the vain-glory of his own excellencies. And do not theſe contrary operations ſomwhat argue a contrary ſpirit moving him? I mean contrary to that which moved in Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

11. Whether it tends not to the quenching of the comfort, and hazzarding of the ſalvation of weak Chriſtians? 1 to the quenching of their comfort. For when from the pure word of God, not ſophiſticated with the intermixture of mans wiſedom and inventions, they have attained to believe and joy in believing, and living by faith in Chriſt, rejoyce in the grace and light of Gods countenance ſhining upon them thorow him; meeting with Mr. *Baxters* work, and finding therein, ſo holy, ſo incomparable a man for learning and piety, ſcattering ſo many doubts, and puzling queſtions about the very beginnings & foundation of our redemption, that himſelf cannot anſwer himſelf otherwiſe than by conjectures, peradventure it may be thus, and it may be it is ſo: The poor ſouls are apt to fall foul upon themſelves, for that they have been ſo audacious to believe any thing, ſeeing now ſo many doubts and uncertainties; and to account all their former joyes in Chriſt to be a deluſion: and being unable to make out the myſtery of their redemption to themſelves in his ſophiſticall way, they lye down and ſink under the burthen of their ſorrow as hopeleſs. It tends to the

hazzarding of their ſalvation alſo. For while he goes about to make them philoſophicall Chriſtians, Popiſh and Socinian Chriſtians, to live not by faith but by ſenſe, not by the word of Gods mouth, but by reaſon, ſo far only to believe as they ſee reaſons in nature to ſupport their faith (for hereunto all Mr. *Baxters* diſputes are levelled) he makes indeed all that will be his Diſciples no Chriſtians. And ſuppoſe that Mr. *Baxter* hath a great confidence by his ſophiſtical diſtinctions and arguments even to wreſt from the Lord Chriſt a crown for himſelf in the day of judgment: yet what ſhall become of his unlearned Diſciples, that are not ſo nimble Sophiſters, nor have their diſtinctions at the fingers end ſo ready as their Maſter? Theſe muſt ſink under the ſentence of Chriſt, having the word againſt, and not being able to plead reaſon enough artificially and ſubtlely for themſelves.

12. Whether it tends not to the corrupting and depraving of all the people of God within the Land? Mr. *Baxter* is no longer a ſtudent, but the higheſt graduate in policy, in that piece of policy at leaſt now moſt in uſe, to ſee and proſecute the neereſt and readieſt way to the attainment of his own ends. His end in this work who ſees not to be the poyſoning of this whole Nation with the worſt of Popiſh errors. For the attainment hereof his whole endeavour and wit is employed to poyſon therewith the Miniſtry (as I have before ſhewed) For his ſophiſtry is of little force to beguile the ignorant which underſtand it not. Therefore notwithſtanding all his ſpecious pretences he lays, and ſpins out his webbs, to catch the learned, them at leaſt that have ſome pieces of learning in them. Theſe he knows to be the pipes and ſluces thorow which the water of life is to be conveyed thorow the Land: If theſe be poyſoned or tainted, the tainture and poyſon will be conveyed to all that come to dip the water of life from them. They *are the light of the world*; if he can prevail to turn *this light into darkneſs*, *how great will be the darkneſs* of this our little world?

13. Whether that kind of learning which he venteth ſo abundantly, and truſteth in ſo confidently, be not that ſecular wiſedom which the Lord hath even curſed, and threatned *to deſtroy and bring to nothing*, *and turn it into fooliſhneſs or madneſs*, 1 Cor. 1. 19, 20. If ſo, both he and we ſhall ſee in good time whoſe counſel ſhall ſtand, either Mr. *Baxters* in counter-working againſt God, ſetting up his wiſedom and learning againſt the wiſedom of God, the wiſedom of the word: or Gods counſell in deſtroying Mr. *Baxters* wiſedom and

and making it, *i.e.* diſcovering it to the world to be meer fooliſhnes, ſo turning his glory into ſhame and baſeneſs.

Laſtly, whether this threat be not in ſome meaſure already executed upon him from heaven? I would I could deny, that I had good grounds upon which to deny it.

But ſith Mr. *Baxter* not contented with the light and wiſedom of the word, hath rolled himſelf into the pits of heathen and Popiſh learning, out of their darkneſs to digg to himſelf ſuch light as is not cohering with, but prejudiciall to the wiſedom of God and his word, whether the Lord hath not turned this wiſedom of his into fooliſhneſs, and yeelded him up to be ſtifled with the moſt pernicious of their errors, and to hug the ſame in his boſom as a treaſure, ſo that he is become one of thoſe ſome of whom the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, which while they profes this ſophiſtical & philoſophical learning, *falſely called ſcience* or *knowledge*, being indeed meerly *prophane and vain babling*, *have erred concerning the faith*, 1 Tim. 6. 20, 21. The ſequell of this his Treatiſe in our examination thereof will ſomewhat declare.

I have here ſpoken once for all in anſwer to his ſophiſtical diſputes, as they are ſophiſticall and imitating the School-Doctors of the Popiſh Church, having reference therein not only to what in this place he ſaith, but to all of the ſame kind, which we ſhall find flowing from him in full tides elſe-where frequently in this book. So that as oft as we meet him ſpeaking again in the ſame tone, I ſhall either paſs him by with ſilence, or els turn him over to that which I have here ſaid.

There remains yet one queſtion more in the explication of this 7th Aphoriſm, and the ſame of as great importance and uſefulneſs, as moſt of the former are vain and ſuperfluous. Mr. *Baxter* thus propoſeth it.

B. *Whether we are juſtified by Chriſts paſſive righteouſneſs only, or alſo by his active?* p. 44.

Here he mentioneth 3. opinions; the firſt he utterly explodeth, *viz.* the imputation of Chriſts active obedience unto Juſtification. The ſecond, *viz.* the efficacy of Chriſts ſufferings to make ſatisfaction to the juſtice of God for our ſinns, whereupon we are forgiven and conſtituted righetous in the ſight of God, he kindly ſaluteth and paſſeth ſome plauſible Complements upon it, and ſo Bids it farewell, without any purpoſe to be in love or familiarity with

it. And then takes up the third as best agreeing with the end he drives at, though in substance it be the same with the first which he shook off and trampled under foot with great defiance as the absurdest of absurdities.

What my judgment (as to the two former) is, I need not here express, because it is not a question controverted between us and the Papists. It is a question not of very long standing. Mr. *Beza* in his Exposition of the Epistle to the *Romans*, by appropriating the severall parts of Christs righteousness to make up the severall parts of Justification, gave the occasion of the dispute, as I conceive. And the difference hath hitherto made no breach of communion and amity between stable and able Divines or Christians. Nay among them that hold for the active righteousnes also, there have bin and are still at present not a few so learned and pious, that it would be no disparagement to Mr. *Baxter* and my self to be admitted as their *Amanuenses*. And therefore I question the truth of that accusation which M^r. *Baxter* layeth on Mr. *Walker*, *pag.* 53. (whom he principally not only meaneth, but also nameth, when he tells us of *ignorant men, that are strong revilers, and weak disputers*, reproaching them for hereticks that dissent from them in judgment. I doubt much that Mr. *Baxters* main end here in declaiming against Mr. *Walker*, is to Apologize for himself, and that his anger against Mr. *Walker* is, because he finds the stroaks which M. *Walker* levelled against Mr. *John Goodwin*, do now more wound Mr. *Baxter* than they did Mr. *Goodwin* then. I remember I once saw that little Tractate of Mr. *Walker* in a friends house, and read cursorily some part of it, in which he charged Mr. *Goodwin* with *Socinianism*, and *Arminianism*. But if my memory fail me not (as too oft it doth) it was not upon this score, that Mr. *Goodwin* maintained Justification by the Passive righteousnes of Christ only, but upon this, that he upheld the τὸ πιστευειν or act of believing, or rather Faith as it is a part or act of our sanctification to be the very thing that is imputed to us for righteousnes. And Mr. *Baxter* cannot deny but this opinion was first broached by *Socinus*, and afterward promoted by *Arminius*. But because Mr. *Baxter* hath taken it up from them, and speaks it out in this his Tractate, more in the full of the mouth, than Mr. *Goodwin* had done, (as wee may see afterward) Therefore to prevent the like imputation of *Socinian* and *Arminian* heresie to himself, by his chafe against Mr *Walker*, he affrights all from charging him therewith. And yet howsoever he seemeth to decline

decline such an imputation, who seeth not that he will, yea doth more readily take up a cursed Heresie from any of these learned Sophisters, then a blessed truth from such ignorant and unstudied Ministers, that glory in nothing but the foolishnes of Christs Cross, and dare not to be wise unto salvation, beyond the rule of the Gospel?

Hence he passeth to his third opinion, which is wholly one with the first in substance, and a little d fference onely made in the sound of words; for the Question was thus propounded, *Whether we are justified by Christs passive Righteousnesse onely, or also by his active?* The Assertors both of the first and of the third opinion, answer both with one consent, we are justified by both: Onely Mr *Baxter* that he may shew his wit and force of his Sophistry, that he can at his pleasure exauctorate any Tenet in Divinity, laying it all defiled and dead in the dust, to be trampled under foot, and then give it a resurrection with a new body, to shew it self as an eminent and orient Pearl, to adorne Christian Religion; doth annihilate, and vilifie it in one sound of words, and after Cannonize it in another. And what is the difference betwixt the opinion which he spewes out as filth and garbage, and that which he sucks and swallowes as the bread of life, and food from heaven? Forsooth, this only, that the one opinion makes the active righteousnes of Christ, together with his passive, to be imputed to us for righteousnes; the other makes the active, together with the passive righteousnes of Christ, satisfactory to Gods justice, to put us into the participation of Righteousnes or Justification. A vast difference in sense, no less then that was, between *Doctor Martin, and Doctor Luther*, or that which one put betwixt the operation and working of *Pepper*, that it was hot in the one, but cold in the other. Mr *Baxter* knowes that the most judicious Assertors of the first opinion, urge no further then to have it granted, that the active as well as the passive obedience of Christ, is meritorious to our redemption and justification. That they are but the more inconsiderate sort that will have it so imputed, that we should be accounted before God as those that have fulfilled all the righteousnes and duties of the Law, in and by Christ fulfilliing the same. Therefore his taking up this opinion as a third opinion, under the name of truth, is but a taking up again as holy and savory, that which before he had rejected as the embryon of ignorant and unstudied brains, full of the greatest absurdities. Page 54.

But

But he tels us, *pag.* 55. that for ten years together he held the paſſive righteouſnes onely effectual to juſtification, but ſince that, he hath been converted. Should I demand, how it came to paſſe that ſo Eagle-eyed a man ſo long doted upon a cloud, in ſtead of *Juno*, and by what means his eyes were at laſt opened, that he ſaw the deluſion, and ſhunned it? Himſelf gives us a hint what to anſwer; and I hope he will not be too angry if we gueſs, ſo far that our conjecture hath his own conſcience (if awaked) giving conſent. 1 Then (to ſpeak nothing of Mr. *Bradſhaw*, whom either by face or writings I never had acquaintance with) that great wit *Grotius*, with his deep and ſublimated ſpeculations, over-poiſed him in his late reading of him. And how hard a thing is it for Mr. *Baxter*, ſo great an admirer and adorer of humane wit and learning, to meet with a brave Sophiſter indeed, and not to cloſe in judgement with him, though a Papiſt, an Apoſtate, and more then a Semi-Atheiſt? ſo far do acute and fine-ſpun diſtinctions prevail with him, more then the honourable Authority of the plain word of God. 2 It is moſt probable that during theſe ten years Mr. *Baxter* held Juſtification by Faith onely according to the Scriptures, and judgement of the Orthodox Churches, therefore ſtuck ſo long to the Doctrine of Juſtification by Chriſts ſole paſſive obedience, as cohering very harmoniouſly therewith. But ſince he hath caſt himſelf into the Channels of Popiſh Writers, and thence derived Juſtification by works, it concern'd him to caſt off his former Opinion, for the ſole paſſive righteouſnes, as being much repugnant to Juſtification by works, and to take up this as authentick, and ſomewhat conducing and helpfull to his Cauſe. For if Chriſts active obedience ſhould not be held meritorious and ſatisfactory to God, with what face could Mr. *Baxter* attribute a prevalency and power herein to our beſt works and actions? I purpoſe not to trifle away time and labour to refel this Doctrine, or to ſhew the weakneſſe of his fine and plauſible Exceptions which he maketh againſt the Objections that he thinks will be made againſt it. himſelf knoweth that ſome of his fore-mentioned Queſtions being granted and cited Opinions which he neither denyeth nor oppoſeth, would turn his Grotian diſtinction of *idem* and *tantundem*, into winde and ſmoake. As for the reſt which he ſpeaketh, we may grant there is ſome plauſibility; but if it were ſearched to the bottome, there would be little of ſolidity found therein. But my purpoſe is (as I have ſaid) onely or chiefly to except againſt his apparently Popiſh Doctrines, and

with

with these he so much aboundeth, that I shall not want matter to take up more time and labour then my other Employments can well afford.

CHAP. IV.

What the immediate effects of Christs sufferings are, which redound to the Redeemed? Whether Believers are under the Curse? And whether their Afflictions in this life be a part of the Curse, and have the wrath of God in them? With Mr. Baxter's *Arguments to prove them such.*

IN this ninth Thesis, and its Explication, Mr. *Baxter* hewes out crooked timber enough for many of the discreetest Divines to employ their time and labour therein, until they are tired, and yet they shall not be able at last to straighten it. It is like *Pandora's* box, which being opened, let out all miseries and mischiefs into the world, as the Poets feign. Whatsoever the Papists teach of the deficiency and maimednes of Christs, and of the necessary supplies of mans satisfaction to be made unto God, of Purgatory, of the uncertainty of Salvation, and many other errors depending upon these, are all couched and compassed here within a very narrow circuit, some expressed, and some implyed. But so that while he hasteth to bind together suddenly (that he may not be seen) so much dreggish Popery in one fardle, in his greatest hast he leaves not his wits behind him, but craftily delivers to us Papisticall Doctrine, yet not in the Papists words, lest he should be espyed and shunned. Thus run his words.

B. Thes. 9. *It was not the intent either of the Father or Son, that by this satisfaction the offenders should be immediately delivered from the whole curse of the Law, and freed from the evil which they had brought upon themselves, but some part must be executed upon the soul and body, and the creatures themselves, and remain upon them at the pleasure of Christ,* Rev. 1. 18. 1 Cor. 15. 26.

The phrase and words of this Position are not a little ambiguous, lest I should seem to wrest them to an evill, when a good sense may be given them, I will not so much as descant upon any thing therein, with the least paraphrase, but take all in his own Explication, which thus followeth.

Explication.

Explication.

B. *The Queſtions that are here to be handled for the explication of this Poſition, are theſe.* 1 Queſt. *Whether the Redeemed are immediately upon the price paid, delivered from any of the Curſe of the Law? if not from all?* Queſt. 2. *Whether the ſufferings of the Elect before Converſion, are in execution of any part of the Curſe of the Law?* 3 *Whether the ſufferings of Believers are from the Curſe of the Law, or onely afflictions of love, the Curſe being taken off by Chriſt.* 4 *Whether it be not a wrong to the Redeemer, that the people whom he hath ranſomed, are not immediately delivered?* 5 *Whether it be any wrong to the Redeemed themſelves?* 6 *How long it will be, till all the curſe be taken off the beleevers, and redemption have attained its full effect?*

I have oft heard, that one fool may put more Queſtions in an hour, then a whole Univerſity of Divines can anſwer in an age. If it be true, what are we to conclude of the Queſtions of Mr *Baxter*, the mirror of his age, for wit and profoundneſs in learning, who ſitteth in the Chair alone, paſſing his cenſure upon all the Divines that are or have been, ſuch are ignorant and unſtudied, ſuch judicious and learned, &c. his Queſtions ſurely will try the brains of men: and oh that he were ſo dexterous in Anſwering as in Queſtioning! Then (to uſe his own words) we would take him for a Divine indeed, yea for a Teacher ſent from Heaven, for no mortal weight upon Earth can anſwer many things which he queſtioneth. Let us therefore hear himſelf anſwering himſelf.

How proves he that *Adam* and *Eve* were then exiſtent, when Chriſt undertook?

B. *To the firſt Queſtion I anſwer. In this caſe the undertaking of ſatisfaction had the ſame immediate effect upon* Adam, *as the ſatisfaction it ſelfe upon us or for us. To determine what theſe are, were an excellent work; it being one of the greateſt and nobleſt Queſtions in our controverted Divinity, what are the immediate effects of Chriſts death? He that can rightly anſwer this is a Divine indeed, and by the help of this may expedite moſt other controverſies about Redemption and Juſtification. In a word, the effects of Redemption undertaken, could not be upon a ſubject, nor yet exiſtent, and ſo no ſubject, though it might be for them. None but* Adam *and* Eve *were then exiſtent, yet aſſoon as we do exiſt, we do receive benefit from it. The ſuſpending of the rigorous execution of the ſentence of the Law, is the moſt obſervable immediate effect of Chriſts death: which ſuſpenſion is ſome kinde of deliverance from it. Of the other effects elſwhere.*

A com-

A compleat and profound anſwer, who ſo ſtupid or way-ward, that he reſteth not ſatisfied with it? The Queſtion was, *Whether the redeemed are immediately upon the price paid delivered from any of the curſe of the Law, if not from all?* He anſwers, in this caſe the undertaking of ſatisfaction had the ſame immediate effects upon *Adam*, as the ſatisfaction it ſelf, upon us, or for us: But what were thoſe immediate effects upon *Adam*? He anſwereth, a riddle, unriddle what this is, what theſe effects are, *& eris mihi magnus Apollo*, ſuch a one ſhall have a Temple built unto him, from which to give anſwer and reſolution to all other queſtions and doubts in Divinity, Oracularly. And who more deſerving of this honour, then Mr. *Baxter*? Who more able to unriddle his own Queſtion, than himſelf? That he therefore may be taken for the Divine indeed, he ſo reſolveth the Queſtion, as his own words above declare. The benefit which *Adam* and *Eve* forthwith received upon Chriſts undertaking to make ſatisfaction for them, is the moſt remarkable immediate effect of Chriſts death, whereof the redeemed partake. But the ſuſpenſion of the rigorous execution of the ſentence of the Law, was the benefit that *Adam* and *Eve* upon ſuch undertaking of Chriſt for them, forthwith received. *Ergo*, The ſuſpending of the rigorous execution of the ſentence of the Law, is the moſt obſervable immediate effect of Chriſts death, whereof the redeemed partake. The Propoſition he proveth thus, becauſ there were none els exiſtent beſides *Adam* and *Eve*, when Chriſt ſo undertook; therefore the effects of his ſatisfaction muſt be upon them, or upon none. The aſſumption he takes to be clear by its own light, onely he addeth, that this ſuſpending was a kind of deliverance.

If this be not the ſum and force of his anſwer to the Queſtion, *Capiat qui capere potis eſt*, I muſt plead my ſelf not guilty of underſtanding him. But it is enough evident that this is his meaning. Now if I lifted to anſwer his Argument, I ſhould tell him that both premiſſes labour of one and the ſame fallacy, which is in Schools termed *Petitio principij*, an aſſuming of that as granted, which is in Queſtion. The validity of both Propoſitions depending upon theſe begg'd Principles, that Chriſt firſt undertook to make ſatisfaction to God for the ſin of *Adam* and *Eve* when they were exiſtent, and that they were in the number of the redeemed ones, as ſoon as they had ſinned, for ſo was the Queſtion, whether the redeemed, *&c.* are freed from any of the Curſe of the Law? Now what Mr. *Baxter* goes about to prove, he doth it by the example of *Adam* and *Eve*, which

is in no wiſe a competent proof, unleſs they be proved firſt to have been exiſtent when Chriſt undertook to ſatisfie, and ſecondly to have been then redeemed. For the moſt obſervable effects of Chriſts death pertain to the redeemed, not to the world. Both propoſitions then being faulty, the Concluſion is not worth a button In charity indeed we do not in any wiſe queſtion the redemption and ſalvation of our firſt parents, (though the time of their converſion be diſputable whether before the curſe inflicted) But not the judgment of charity, but the undeceiving word of God muſt be made the ground of our Faith. Untill therfore he bring ſome proof of Scripture that *Adam* and *Eve* were exiſtent when Chriſt undertook then alſo and redeemed, in all that he ſaith, he ſaith nothing.

Yet becauſe this ſtill leaveth *ſub judice litem*, and certain Concluſions cannot be inferred upon premiſſes left uncertain. I ſhould anſwer ſecondly, That the Curſe pronounced and inflicted upon *Adam*, related to him not as a private but publike perſon. For ſo he fell, and ſo was he ſentenced. As comprehending the Elect, he had the bleſſing of the ſeed of the woman, but as repreſenting thoſe that periſh, ſo he had the Curſe. But touching thoſe things which he and the other godly do ſuffer, the learned *Sadeel* (*Adverſus humanas ſatisfactiones*) anſwereth this Popiſh Argument here propoſed by Mr. *Baxter*, out of *Auguſtine*. *Poſſet aliquis dicere*, (ſaith *Auguſtine*) *Si propter peccatum Deus dixerit homini, In ſudore vultus tui edes panem tuum, & ſpinas & tribulos proferet tibi terra*, &c. *Cur fideles poſt peccatorum remiſſionem eoſdem dolores patiuntur? Reſpondemus* (ſaith *Auſtin*) *Ante remiſſionem eſſe ſupplicia peccatorum poſt remiſſionem eſſe certamina exercitationeſq; juſtorum, i. e.* Some one may ſay, If for ſin God ſaid to man, *In the ſweat of thy face thou ſhalt eat thy bread, and the earth ſhall bring forth to thee bryars and thorns*, &c. Why do the beleevers after the remiſſion of ſinns ſuffer theſe ſorrowes? We anſwer (ſaith *Auſtin*) Before remiſſion theſe are puniſhments of ſinns, after remiſſion they are tryalls and exerciſes of the Righteous. Whereunto *Sadeel* addeth, *Non ſequitur, ſi mors & vitæ præſentis ærumnæ per ſe ſunt peccati pœnæ quippe propter peccatum in mundum ingreſſæ; eas eſſe proptered peccatorum pœnas ipſis etiam fidelibus, quibus peccata ſunt propter Chriſtum condonata? i. e.* It followeth not if death and the ſorrows of the preſent life be in themſelves the puniſhments of ſinn, becauſe they entred into the world for or by means of ſinn; that they are therefore puniſhments of ſinn to the very faithfull alſo, to whom their ſinns are forgiven for Chriſts ſake.

But

But to do him a pleaſure ſhould we give him his Argument, forgiving the unſoundnes of it; what doth he conclude? Thus much that the ſuſpending of the rigorous execution of the ſentence of the Law is the moſt obſervable immediate effect of Chriſts death, that the redeemed of the Lord partake of. By ſuſpending the rigorous execution of the Law, he means, that he doth forbear an hour or a day, or ſome ſhort time, to deſtroy their lives and caſt their ſouls into hell: But ſo that every moment they muſt ſtand in expectation of it, and that to their greater torment at laſt, as their ſinns during the time of the ſuſpenſion is increaſed. Whoſoever now of Gods redeemed ones receives comfort by this doctrine, will (I doubt not) give his verdit for Mr. *Baxter*, having ſo nobly and divinely reſolved this queſtion; that He is a Divine indeed.

He tells us there be other effects of Chriſts death, &c. But he is not at leiſure now to communicate them. But if they have no more ſweet and marrow than this, let him keep them to himſelf, we will not be inquiſitive after them.

P. 68. B. *To the ſecond Queſtion. The Elect before Converſion do ſtand in the ſame relation to the Law and Curſe, as other men, though they be differenced in Gods Decree.* Eph. 2. 3, 12.

Very ſhort, yet not ſo ſweet as ſhort. He ſaith it, but he proves it not. For the Scripture which he brings for proof, doth onely declare what the Elect are by nature before converſion, not what they are before God in relation to his Covenant of Grace. But Mr. *Baxter* purpoſeth to ſpeak more largely hereunto in another place, which will give me occaſion to enlarge my anſwer. At preſent he is in travell with his anſwer to the third queſtion, and cannot be at reſt untill he be delivered of ſo beautifull a Monſter, and thus it comes from him.

Bix. *To the third queſtion. I confeſs we have here a knotty queſtion; The common judgment is, that Chriſt hath taken away the whole Curſe (though not the ſuffering) by bearing it himſelf; and now they are onely Afflictions of Love, and not puniſhments. I do not contradict this Doctrine, through affectation of ſingularity, the Lord knoweth; but through conſtraint of judgment; and that upon theſe grounds following.*

1 *It is undeniable that Chriſts taking the Curſe upon himſelf did not wholly prevent the execution upon the offender.* Ge. 3. 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19.

2 *It is evident from the event, ſeeing we feel part of the Curſ fulfilled on us: we eat in labor and ſweat; the earth doth bring forth thorns and brayars; women bring forth their children in ſorrow; our native pravity is the Curſ upon our ſouls; we are ſick, weary, full of fears, ſorrows and ſhame, and at laſt we dye and turn to duſt.*

3 *The Scripture tells us that we all dye in* Adam, *(even that death from which we muſt at the Reſurrection be raiſed by Chriſt,)* 1 Co. 15. 21, 22. *And that death is the wages of ſin.* Ro. 6. 23. *and that the ſickneſs and weakneſs and death of the godly, is cauſed by their ſins.* 1 Co. 11. 30, 31. *And if ſo, then doubtles they are in execution of the Law, though not in full rigour.*

4 *It is manifeſt that our ſufferings are in their own nature evils to us, and the ſanctifying of them to us, taketh not away their naturall evil, but onely produceth by it, as by an occaſion, a greater good: Doubtles ſo farr as it is an effect of ſinn it is evill, and the effect of the Law alſo.*

5 *They are aſcribed to Gods anger, as the moderating of them is aſcribed to his love.* Pſa. 30. 5. *and a thouſand places more*

6 *They are called puniſhments in ſcripture, and therefore we may call them ſo.* Lev. 26 41, 43. Lam. 3. 39. & 4. 6, 22. Ezras 9. 13. Hoſ. 4. 9. & 12. 2. Lev. 26. 18, 24.

7 *The very nature of affliction is to be a loving puniſhment, a naturall evil ſanctified, and ſo to be mixt of evil and good, as it proceeds from mixt cauſes. Therefore to ſay that Chriſt hath taken away the Curſ and evill, but not the ſufferings, is a contradiction, becauſ ſo farr as it is ſuffering it is to us evill and the execution of the Curſ. What Reaſon can be given why God ſhould not do us all that good without our ſufferings which now he doth by them, if there were not ſin and wrath and law in them? Sure he could better us by eaſier means.*

8 *All thoſe Scriptures and Reaſons that are brought to the contrary, do prove no more but this, that our afflictions are not the Rigorous execution of the Law, that they are not wholly or chiefly in wrath; but as the common love of God to the wicked is mixt with hatred in their ſufferings, and the hatred prevaileth above the love; ſo the ſufferings of the godly proceed from a mixture of Love and Anger, and ſo have in them a mixture of good and evil; But the Love overcometh the Anger, therefore the good is greater than the evill, and ſo death hath loſt its ſting,* 1 Co. 15. 55, 56. *There is no unpardoned ſin in it which ſhall procure further judgement, and ſo no hatred though there be anger.*

9 *The Scripture ſaith plainly that death is one of the enemies that is not yet overcome, but ſhall be laſt conquered.* 1 Co. 15. 26. *And of our corruption the caſe is plain.*

10 The

10 *The whole ſtream of ſcripture maketh Chriſt to have now the diſpoſing of us and our ſufferings, to have prevented the full execution of the Curſe, and to manage that which lyeth on us to our advantage, and good; but no where doth it affirm that he ſuddenly delivereth us.*

We have here an Antiſcripturall, and an Antichriſtian Concluſion; yea a concluſion that hath many Antichriſtian and Popiſh Concluſions involved therein. Therefore Mr. *Baxter* being extremely ambitious that an aſſertion of that nature ſhould ſtand, hath pillared and propped it up with no leſs than ten Arguments, delighted more (as it ſeemes) with number than with the waight and ſtrength of them. And that he may go orderly to work, he forelaies ſuch a ſtating of the queſtion as may not diſadvantage him, leaving the queſtion obſcure and ambiguous ſtill. The Common judgment (ſaith he) *i. e.* The Conſenting judgment of all the reformed Churches is, that *Chriſt hath taken away the whole Curſe, (though not the ſufferings) by bearing it himſelf, and now they are afflictions of love and not puniſhments.* Who can perſwade the Serpent to be ſtreight, and ceaſe from Crookednes and winding in his motions? He that mainteineth a good Cauſe needs no ſhifts; ſimplicity, ingenuity and plain dealing ſufficeth him. Shall we think that Mr. *B:* minceth and maimeth the judgment of the Orthodox Divines, but for the advantaging of the Popiſh Cauſe which he mainteins againſt them? With a Counited Judgment they aſſert a totall freedome by Chriſt, both from the Curſe and the ſufferings alſo, as they have reference to the execution of the law, yea from the law alſo as it threateneth and curſeth them that are in Chriſt: ſo that their ſufferings are chaſtiſements and tryalls, flowing from the ſame grace & love from which Chriſt himſelf and the redemption which we have by him have iſſued, diſpenſed toward them by a gracious and reconciled father, not inflicted upon them by an incenſed and unreconciled Judge. But Mr. *B:* caſteth a veil over their judgments, and lets but a corner thereof to appeare; becauſe if he had ſet forth their judgment at the full, it would have marr'd moſt of his Arguments wherewith he fights againſt them.

CHAP. V.

CHAP. V.

The question stated between Mr: Baxter (*and the Papists and Arminians whom he followeth*) *and the Protestants whom he opposeth. Scriptures and Arguments from scripture produced by the Protestants to prove.* 1 *That Beleevers are not subject to the Curse:* 2*ly, That their sufferings have not the wrath and hatred, but the love of God in them, are not vindicatory judgments but Chastigatory tryalls.*

LEt us now a little more fully state the question, by shewing wherein that which Mr. *B:* calleth the Common judgment, and that which is his own (pretendedly at least) private judgment, do consent together, and wherein they differ either from other, and so we shall avoyd all impertinencies and strife about words, which are besides the question.

It is agreed then on both sides,

1 That the Curse is the penalty, or the revenging Judgment, or an effect of Gods revenging wrath, by the execution whereof he taketh satisfaction to his justice upon Transgressors for the breach of his Law; so Mr. *B.* makes it out, *p.* 17.

2 That the justice of God is so fully satisfied by bearing this Curse or penalty, as by a complete fulfilling of all the righteousness which the Law requireth, *p.* 48, 50.

3 That the Lord Christ hath undertaken and made full satisfaction to God for all the sinnes of beleevers, bearing the curse due to them, and paying (if not the *idem* according to Mr. *B:* yet) the *tantundem* that their debt did amount to.

4 That God resteth as fully satisfied with this satisfaction of Christ, as if it had been made personally by the beleevers themselves. These two last Mr. *B:* so frequently asserteth that there is no need to quote the places.

To which I may add, 5 That Afflictions are incident to the beleevers as well as to the unbeleevers, so that *Love and hatred are not discernable* to the lookers on, *by that which befalls men in this life, Eccle.* 9. 1.

6 That these afflictions have in them a smart and bitternes, as they befall the very Saints, so that oft-times in their apprehension the very

very wrath and curſe of God ſeemes to be in them. Theſe two things we grant Mr. *B:* ſo that hitherto the judgements conſent. *Heb.* 12. 11.

The difference then betwixt him and us conſiſts principally in theſe two things.

1 Whether when Chriſt hath by doing their law, paying their debt, and bearing their curſe, ſatisfied the juſtice of God for the ſinns of beleevers; when God hath accepted the ſatisfaction given, when the beleevers have by faith apprehended and laid hold on it: They do yet remain liable to the curſe of the Law in whole or in part to be inflicted upon them?

2 Whether the afflictions which God inflicteth upon beleevers in this life, are the effects of Gods revenging juſtice, the Curſe which the law threateneth, and ſo conſequently whether after that God hath taken ful ſatisfaction from Chriſt, he doth in whole or in part require and take ſatisfaction from them alſo; Mr. *Baxter* with the *Papiſts* and *Arminians* mainteins the affirmative of both theſe queſtions, we the Negative: He that 1 after Chriſt hath born the Curſe of the law for beleevers, they are liable to beare it in whole or in part themſelves alſo. And 2 that the afflictions which they ſuffer are from the revenging juſtice of God, the effects and Curſe of the Law, vindictive puniſhments of ſin, full of the wrath of God; as in this his anſwer to the 3 queſtion he declares himſelf. But we utterly deny both theſe propoſitions, either that the beleever is any more after his union to Chriſt, ſubject to the Curſe, or that the afflictions which he ſuffereth have the Curſe of the law and revenging juſtice of God in them, but proceed (not from the wrath of an angry judge, but) from the tender grace and love of a moſt wiſe and indulgent Father. Both theſe aſſertions we ground upon evident Teſtimonies of Scripture.

Firſt, that beleevers are no more liable to, but wholly freed from the Curſe, we have the Holy Ghoſt affirming, *Gal.* 3. 13, 14. *Chriſt hath redeemed us from the Curſe of the law, being made a Curſe for us,* &c. *that the bleſſing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jeſus Chriſt, that we might receive the promiſe of the Spirit, through faith.* What can be ſaid more cleer and full to the Confirmation of our aſſertion, or refuting of Mr. *Baxters?* The Holy Ghoſt ſaith not, Chriſt hath purchaſed to us a liberty for the future that in time we may be delivered from the Curſe, but he hath redeemed us, hath obteined a preſent freedome for us, from the Curſe of the Law. And how?

how? *being made a curſe for us.* He hath made preſent payment that we might have preſent deliverance. Even as a ſurety making full ſatisfaction to the Creditor for the principalls debt, obteins thereby for him a preſent diſcharge from his obligation: not that he ſhall be for a ſeaſon liable to arreſts and impriſonments, and after much fear and ſufferings in this kinde, be at laſt diſcharged. This were enough, but the wiſdome of the Holy Ghoſt proceeds yet further to evidence this truth, and to ſtop every mouth that ſhall preſume to open it ſelf againſt it. That the bleſſing of *Abraham* might come [even] upon the Gentiles [beleeving] *viz.* the promiſe of the Spirit, or Spirit promiſed, by faith. All muſt acknowledg that the entrance of the bleſſing, and removeall of the Curſe by the vertue of Chriſts death, are *coætanea*, of one time and ſtanding. But the bleſſing which is the receiving of the Spirit, is actually and oft in the beleevers own ſpirituall feeling, exiſtent and working in him aſſoon as by faith he is united to Chriſt. Therefore alſo aſſoon as he is united to Chriſt, he is actually freed from the Curſe of the Law. Again, *Rom.* 8. 1. *There is no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Jeſus.* It will not be denyed here that condemnation is either put for or includeth in it the puniſhment to which the offenders are adjudged or condemned, and ſo the meaning of the words muſt be this: that there is remaining, no curſe, no vengeance, to which they that are in Chriſt might be condemned; nor any ſentence to adjudge or condemn them to it, *viz.* becauſe Chriſt hath born both for them, and in their ſtead. This is fully confirmed in the ſecond verſe, but I forbear to annex it, becauſe it is capable of many interpretations, which would be too long here to inſert, but all tending to the Confirmation of this truth laid down in the firſt verſe. And if there be no condemnation, no vengeance, no curſe to which beleevers are ſubject, than are they freed from the Curſe as well in its parts as in the whole. So *Rom.* 6. 14. *Sin ſhall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under the Law but under Grace.* In what reſpects ſhall not Sin have dominion over beleevers? It is expreſſed partly *ver.* 12. *It ſhall not ſo reign that they ſhould obey it in the luſts thereof.* And more fully before *cap.* 5. 21. It ſhall not ſo reign, as formerly it hath reigned unto death, *i. e.* to expoſe them to the curſe and wrath. Why? Becauſe *they are not under the law but under grace.* The law denounceth and Gods revenging juſtice inflicteth the Curſe, yet upon none beſides them which are under the law. But beleevers, having done their law in and by Chriſt, come no more under the dominion of the

the law to be cursed by it, but ever after they are in Christ, they are under Grace, at the disposition and under the dispensation of Gods grace, from which all blessings, but no curse hath its derivation. No less absurd therefore is it to say, that beleevers are liable to the Curse, than to affirm that the Curse is an effect of Gods grace, and not of his revenging justice. And is there any thing less to be gathered from thapostle, affirming *Col.* 2. 14. *That Christ hath blotted out that Hand-writing of ordinances which was against us, and contrary to us, and taken it away, nailing it to his Cross.* What was there in that hand-writing of Gods lawes and ordinances, more against us and contrary to us than the curse? but this th'apostle affirms Christ to have blotted out, cancelled, crucified, in respect of any further power that it can challenge over the Saints. Or when the promise of God is thus gone forth, I *will be mercifull to their unrighteousness, and their sinns and their iniquities will I remember no more*, Heb. 8. 12. Who will give any other interpretation to these words but this, that God will not be wanting in his grace to remember the iniquities of beleevers to purg them from it, yet he will never more so remember it, as to inflict the curse and wrath upon them for it? Not to heap up scriptures beyond measure to this purpose, I shal conclude with that of the Apostle, *Rom.* 8. 15. *Ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear, but the Spirit of Adoption whereby we cry Abba, Father*, When was their time of bondage and fear, but when they were under the law? or what did they fear, but the curse, death, and wrath, which the law threatned? But now being in Christ, & freed from the law, they have received together with a new Condition or relation a new Spirit, a Spirit not of fear but of Confidence, not of fear, because they have a freedom from the law and curse which before held them *all their life time in fear*: but of Confidence, because that being in Christ they are adopted to be the children of God, no more to fear the curse from him as a Judge, but to dwell upon his mercies as the mercies of an indulgent Father.

Enough for the confirmation of the first assertion, and in all that hath been said, there is nothing of the fallacies and querks of mans wit and learning, but the very demonstration of the Spirit by the word. The proof of the second is included in this. If true beleevers are not obnoxious and liable to the Curse and wrath of God, it must follow by necessary Consequence, that then the afflictions and sorrowes which befall them here, are no parts of the Curse or effects of Gods vindicative justice upon them. But further to mani-

feſt that they are fruits of Gods love, and diſcending from the grace of God, I ſhall annex ſome Scriptures that give their ſuffrage hereunto.

Firſt, that in *Heb.* 12. 5.—8. may ſtand in ſtead of all, in which the Apoſtle doth ſo fully diſpute and determine this queſtion, as if it had been in his dayes Controverted. He will not have us to *forget that exhortation which ſpeaketh unto us as to children; My ſon, deſpiſe not thou the chaſtening of the Lord, neither faint when thou art rebuked of him. For whom the Lord loveth he chaſteneth and ſcourgeth every ſon whom he receiveth. If ye endure chaſtening God dealeth with you as with ſonnes, for what ſon is he whom he chaſteneth not? But if ye are without chaſtiſement, whereof all are partakers, ye are baſtards and no ſonnes.* Three Arguments eminent above the reſt we here receive from the hand of the Apoſtle, full to our purpoſe. 1 He calls the afflictions of the Saints Chaſtenings or Chaſtiſements, not puniſhments or judgements, inſinuating that the troubles which they ſuffer, *toto cælo differunt*, have a vaſt difference from thoſe which fall upon the ungodly. Chaſtiſements tend to the amending, ſpirituallizing and perfecting of thoſe that are exerciſed therewith, as appeareth by the 11 verſe of this Chapter. But the judgments which proceed from the Law and revenging juſtice of God, work to the tormenting and totall deſtruction of them upon whom they are inflicted. 2 He affirmes them to have their riſe from that new relation unto God whereunto by faith they are advanced, *viz.* to be the Children of God. They that are not Children undergo in their afflictions the vengeance of God, But the Children are under the ſweet diſcipline and loving Chaſtiſements of a Father, a moſt wiſe and moſt provident Father that ſeeks and in all his diſcipline worketh for the bettering, not for the deſtroying of his Children, *judgeth*, i. e. Correcteth them, and by correction holds *them* in from evill and apoſtacy, *that they may not be condemned with the world*, 1 Cor. 11. 32. 3 He pronounceth their troubles to be the effects of Gods love, *whom he loveth, he chaſteneth*, &c. but the Curſe and revenging judgments of the Law proceed from his hatred. The Law brandiſheth its Curſe againſt enemies whom God hateth, 1 *Tim.* 1. 9. not againſt the Children of his boſom, of his love. *Againſt theſe there is no law*, i. e. no power in the law to Curſe and Condemn, *Gal.* 5. 18, 23. Or when the Holy Ghoſt Calleth the afflictions of beleevers, *Tryalls, fiery tryalls*, ſuch as is the *tryall of the gold*, 1 Pet. 1. 7. & 4. 12. doth he not denote a Contra-diſtinct difference betwæn the afflictions of the beleevers

leevers and the unbeleevers? Men cast wood and stubble into the fire to Consume them, but the gold and silver into the fornace, to try, refine, and purifie them, that they may be of precious and honourable use to them. The one they cast from themselves, the other they fit for their use and service that they may never be lost. Such difference is there betwixt the fire of the curse into which God casteth the wicked from himself to be devoured, and the fiery tryall, or fire of tryall, into which he casteth his Saints for the further purifying and perfecting of their faith and sanctification, that they may become vessells of honour in his house for ever. And when the Scripture speaketh so oft of *Rejoycing in afflictions*, pronouncing it the duty of Christians so to do; as *Mat.*5. 11, 12. *Col.* 1. 24. 1 *Pet.*4. 13. is it not implyed that their sufferings are altogether flowing from and dispensed by the grace and love of God. For who can or ever was directed by the holy Ghost to rejoyce in the wrath of God, or in the effects of Gods wrath against him, such as are the curse and vengeance? Or when the Lord Christ affirmes the eternall Father to be the *Husbandman of his Vineyard the Church*, using his hook to cut off and *cast away the fruitles branches*, i. e. the false Christians, but his pruning knife to better & perfect the fruitfull branches, *i. e.* the true beleevers, *Joh.* 15. 1, 2. Doth not this declare his administrations to be in hatred and defiance to the one, but in love and blessings to the other, even when he pruneth and woundeth them? And when the promise of God is gone forth in relation to the beleevers, not to exempt them from, but to support them in, and bless unto them all their sufferings; *when they pass thorow the waters, to be with them, and thorow the Rivers, that they shall not overflow them, when they walk thorow the fire, they shall not be burnt, neither shall the flame kindle upon them*, Isa. 43. 2. Surely these waters and fires are not the curse as the curse, in which God will so accompany and perfect them, but as his preserving them in it, so his leading them into it, is from his love and not from his hatred. From all which we may boldly conclude, that the sufferings which befall beleevers in this life, are not the penalty or Curse of the Law, or any part of it, nor yet proceed from Gods revenging justice: but fatherly Chastisements proceeding from the love and Grace of their heavenly Father.

Chap. VI.

Mr. Baxters *ten Arguments for the contrary assertions examined and answered.*

TO the ten Arguments of Mr. *Baxter*, by which he goeth about to fortifie his two contrary assertions, I answer in their order. To the first drawn from Gods dealing with our first parents, I have answered before. He must first prove these two things; first, that they were beleevers, which a meer and dark promulgation of a Saviour, *Gen.* 3. 15. doth not evince, (for many thousands have had the Gospel more fully and cleerly preached to them, yet have continued in unbeleef) Secondly, that the sufferings to which his quotations direct, were inflicted upon them as a Curse by Gods revenging justice; and untill he hath proved both these, his Argument is beside the question. It being not denyed by that which he calls the Common judgement, either that unbeleevers are under the Curse, or that beleevers are subject to sufferings, though not to the Curse; but a full answer to this Argument was given before out of *Austin* and *Sadeel.*

To the second I answer, that it laboreth of the same fallacy with the former. That the wicked feel all those sorrowes that he mentioneth, and bear the curse and hatred of God in them, is not denied. But the godly have their part in the same sorrowes, yet they bear not the curse and hatred of God therein. This he was to have proved, and untill he hath proved it, he saith nothing but slides from the question; which (if he will but look an inch backward to his own words) he thus stateth. That the Common judgment is that Christ hath taken away the whole Curse, being made a Curse for us, yet exerciseth his own people with sufferings, which unto them are onely afflictions of love, &c. Against this opinion he opposeth himself, undertaking to prove that these also have not onely their sufferings, but also the Curse of God in their sufferings. Now the second argument which he brings to prove this, is that the godly suffer the same things which are inflicted upon the wicked as a curse. What is this to the purpose? he doth herein but beat the ayr, and fight against the winde, and bark at the Moon, comes not neer them whom he makes his adversaries in this question. For they confess the sufferings, but deny the curse. He must therefore prove that

the

the curſe as the curſe, is inflicted upon the Saints, els he comes no neerer the queſtion, than, *Ararim Parthus bibit aut Germania Tigrim.* For all that is here ſaid denyeth not all the ſufferings of the Saints to be chaſtiſements and afflictions of love. What the Apoſtle ſaith of one of them is true of the reſt alſo, *viz.* womens bringiug forth of their children in ſorrow. *Shee ſhall be ſaved by childbearing,* (διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, is the Originall, though our Tranſlation hath it [and not by] childbearing, *if ſhee continue in faith and charity, and holines with ſobriety.* The meaning is (notwithſtanding the Popiſh falſe gloſſe given it) that although ſorrow in Childbearing was firſt inflicted upon that ſexe as a part of Gods Curſe for ſin, yet as many as beleeve ſhall finde the Curſe removed, and a bleſſing in the place thereof. It ſhall be made a happy furtherance to their ſalvation, putting them in minde of their ſin that firſt brought the ſorrow, and ſo filling them with ſelf-deniall and ſelf-abhorring, that they ſhall cleave the faſter to Chriſt for ſalvation by Faith, as knowing themſelves forlorn in themſelves, and ſtand the more fixed and ſtedfaſt in charity, holines, and ſobriety. The like is to be concluded of the reſt of the ſufferings which he particularizeth, God ſo diſpenſeth them that they may be furtherances of ſalvation to beleevers, by working in them humblednes and ſelf-denyall, bearing up themſelves by faith in Chriſt alone, both for ſalvation and increaſe of their ſanctification. The very pravity of our nature of which he ſpeaketh is left in us not as a curſe in wrath, but as a means in Gods wiſdome and love more to humble us, to make us more to cleave unto Chriſt, and an Antagoniſt againſt which fighting in the power and ſpirit of Chriſt we may *overcome*, and having overcome may obtein the Crown. So that theſe two Arguments are impertinent and nothing to the queſtion. 1 Tim. 2. 15

To the third, I anſwer that there is nothing els in it but a wreſting of Scriptures from their proper ſenſe that they may be ſubſervient to Mr. *Baxters* ends. Firſt that of 1 *Cor.* 15. 21, 22. maketh nothing to his purpoſe. It onely teſtifieth *that as by man came death*, i. e. by *Adam*, *ſo by man*, i. e. by Chriſt *came the reſurrection.* But how far both of the members of this propoſition reach, is manifeſt by the following words. *For as in Adam all dye*, i. e. all that live and die in *Adam* periſh hopeleſly and everlaſtingly: *So in Chriſt all ſhall be made alive*, i. e. All that are tranſlated out of *Adam* into Chriſt. The one man being the root of death to himſelf, and all that are in him: the other the root of life to himſelf, and to all that by faith ſhall be ingrafted

ingraffed into him. That this is the genuine meaning of the words is evident by the next verſe, which amplifieth what th'apoſtle had ſaid in this, *viz.* who are theſe all that ſhall be made alive in Chriſt? Firſt, *Chriſt* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *as the firſt fruits, then they that are Chriſts at his coming.* Here is no mention of the reſurrection of them that are not in Chriſt. Not that theſe ſhall not alſo be raiſed by Chriſt, but that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh here not of reſurrection in generall, but of reſurrection to life, whereof thoſe that are in Chriſt do alone partake: Even as of thoſe which dye in *Adam* he ſpeaketh of an everlaſting death, whereof the unregenerate alone partake. So that there is not any mention here expreſſed of the death of beleevers, much leſſe of the curſe and wrath in their death. Touching the ſecond Scripture which he quoteth and citeth, *Rom.* 6. 23. *The wages of ſin is death:* who doubts but it is ſo to them that are under the guilt and dominion of ſin? But what is this to beleevers? And the third Scripture is as pat as the two former. *For this cauſ many of you are ſick, many weak, many ſleep.* The Apoſtle here writes to a viſible Church, in which it appears there were ſome true, and ſome but formall and temporary beleevers. Chriſt is in the midſt of this Church diſpenſing his diſcipline. The true beleevers by the contagion of the formall profeſſors had ſomewhat prophaned the Lords Table by reſorting to it ſomewhat diſorderly. The other had totally violated it by coming to it drunken (and ſo were worſe than beaſts) from their own Tables; here now had Chriſt inflicted chaſtiſements of ſicknes and weaknes for the humbling and amending of thoſe that were his, but death and vengeance upon them that while they profeſſed faith in him, yet were indeed deſpiſers of him and his ordinances. What is this to the Curſe of the Law upon beleevers? Therefore I ſhall add to Mr. *Baxters* [And if ſo] my [and if ſo,] if ſo that wreſting of Scriptures will ſerve the turn, Mr. *Baxter* will ſurely have the water run in his ground, and his fancy ſtand, though Gods truth thereby fall to the earth.

To the fourth. That his phraſe is ambiguous, and it is not eaſily underſtood what ſo cunning a ſophiſter meaneth by *evills.* Untill therefore he hath diſcharged his buſhell of diſtinctions, putting a difference (after his manner) between a naturall and a metaphyſicall good, whereof this evill is a privation, between an evill phyſicall, and an evill morall, and an evill in a theologicall ſenſe, between the evill of ſenſe and the evill of ioſs, and a whole bundle more of evills that he can diſtinguiſh into their kinds, we know

know not what he meaneth when he ſaith that ſufferings are in their own nature evills to us. If I ſhould anſwer in one ſenſe, he hath the ſlight quickly to evade to another: and to ſtudy out all his evills would coſt more labor than a hundred ſuch Arguments and all his evills to boot are worthy of. As for that which he addeth, *Doubtles ſo far as it is the effect of ſin, it is evill and the effect of the Law alſo.* It is as much as if he had ſaid, doubtles ſo far as the Sun is made or is the effect of a thunder-cloud, it is black and dark, and the effect of the Thunderbolt alſo. We deny it to be the effect of ſin as the meritorious cauſe thereof, ſo that the ſuffering of a beleever ſhould be the curſe or revenging puniſhment of his ſin, [Chriſt hath born that] and ſo it ſhall not be (in this reſpect) evill, nor the effect of the law neither. We grant a beleevers ſin to be oft the occaſion, never the proper cauſe of a beleevers ſufferings.

To the fifth. We deny not the ſufferings of beleevers to be oft in Scripture aſcribed to Gods Anger. But it is ſo aſcribed, 1 Ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, to ſet forth Gods dealings to mans dull underſtanding by a ſimilitude of mans paſſions, that they might be the more eaſily comprehended. Becauſe man in his anger and wrath doth correct moſt ſeverely, therefore the ſufferings of the Saints when they are great and grievous are ſaid to come from Gods anger, and therefore ſaid to be from his anger, to ſpeak out that they are great afflictions, ſuch as children receive from their parents when they are moſt hot in their paſſion: Not that there is indeed any ſuch paſſion in God. 2 In reſpect of the ſufferers apprehenſion, who being weak in faith and too much prejudiced by ſenſe, is apt for a ſeaſon ſometimes in great tryalls to conclude himſelf to be caſt out of Gods favour, and overwhelmed with his wrath and fury. Not that it is ſo really, For God hath forgiven their ſinns, Therefore after his forgiving to retain wrath and anger may be aſcribed to malicious men, whom we ſhall hear ſaying, I will forgive but never forget him: But in no wiſe to the moſt righteous God, who *ſo forgiveth* the ſinns of beleevers as that *he will never more remember them.*

To the ſixth. I will not fall into a λογομαχίαν, a ſtrife and diſpute about words and names. Let Mr. *Baxter* agree with us in the matter, and we will not ſtick to cloſe with him in the name and words; Let him deny all malignity and curſe in the ſufferings of the godly, and to do him a pleaſure we will call them puniſhments as he doth. After that God had new named *Jaakob* calling him *Iſrael*, he remained ever after indifferently called either *Jaakob* or *Iſrael* ſtill, the new

new name made it not a ſin to make uſe of the old alſo. So though the ſufferiugs of the Saints which under the Law were uſually termed puniſhments and judgments are now under the Goſpel as it were baptized with new names which more ſet forth their nature, ſuch as are, *Chaſtiſements* and *Tryalls*; yet is it no ſin to uſe the old as well as the new names ſtill, for we ſee the penmen of the New Teſtament to have done it before us.

To the Seventh. Mr. *Baxter* is here returned again to his evils; and either I underſtand not what his meaning is, or if I do underſtand him, I find a pack of little ſence, and much arrogance, a compound of abſurdities and preſumptions, Abſurdities in the Argument it ſelf, arrogance and preſumption in that which he ſpeaketh for the confirmation thereof. Firſt we have his abſurd nonſenſe. *The very nature of affliction* (ſaith he) *is to be a loving puniſhment, a naturall evill ſanctified, and ſo to be mixed of evill and good, as it proceedeth from mixt cauſes.* Let him that can, make ſenſe and truth here meet together, I cannot. By evil I muſt needs conjecture he means the evill not of ſin, but of puniſhment. For the evill of ſin, as ſin, cannot be mixt of evill and good, being altogether evill. By affliction ever ſince I underſtood words, I have concluded to be meant any vexation, trouble, ſorrow, anguiſh, or torment, that a man hath inflicted upon him by God or the Creature. If this be not affliction, I never knew affliction. If it be ſo, it is a meer abſurdity to affirm every affliction to be a loving puniſhment, a naturall evill ſanctified, mixed of evill and good, *&c.* *Pharaoh* afflicted *Iſrael*, and the Devill afflicted *Job*, did either *Pharaoh* or the Devill mean or act love in afflicting? or ſanctifie the evill which they inflicted? or had the evill which they inflicted either love or good in its own nature? who but a man in a dream will affirm any of this gear? It cannot be pronounced and concluded that the afflictions which are from the Creature, as from the Creature, to have ſuch qualifications as Mr. *Baxter* aſcribeth to them, either from their own nature, or from the will and infuſion of the Creature inflicting them. And no leſs abſurd is it to attribute ſuch qualifications to affliction univerſally as it proceeds from God, either immediately, or mediately by the Creature. The torment of the reprobate men, and Devils in Hell, muſt be granted to be an affliction, and that it is God which afflicts them. To conclude hence becauſe it is an affliction, an affliction from God, it is a loving puniſhment, a ſanctified evill, mixt of good and evill, as proceeding from mixt

Cauſes,

Cauſes, is ſuch an abſurdity, that although Mr. *Baxter* in words affirm it,* yet would he be as loath at any of the oppoſite opinion to try it. If he had ſaid *Chaſtiſements* are in their own nature ſo qualified, we ſhould have born with it; but he ſhunneth that word as a rock upon which he might have daſhed the Curſe againſt believers, wherewith as with a treaſure he hath laden the Barque of his diſputation in this place. From ſuch falſe and abſurd premiſſes therefore to inferr this Concluſion [*Therefore to ſay that Chriſt hath taken away the Curſe and evill but not the ſuffering, is a meer contradiction, becauſ ſo far as it is a ſuffering, it is evill to us and the execution of the Curſe*] is as fallacious, as the premiſſes abſurd. Fallacious many wayes, 1 In jumbling in the execution of the Curſ, which was neither expreſſed nor implyed in the premiſſes. 2 In couniting together evill and the curſe as equipollent terms, which are oft diſparates. No man beſides Mr. *Baxter* will conclude every evill of ſuffering to be the Curſe. *Chriſt mourned for the ſins of Jeruſalem*, Mat. 23. 37. Lu. 19. 42. *Paul had continuall heavineſſe and ſorrow in heart for the unbelief of Iſrael*, Rom. 9. 2. *Jeremy had his ſoul weeping in ſecret, and his eyes running down with teares, for the ſin and afflictions of his people*. Jer. 13. 17. This mourning, heavines, and weeping, were ſufferings, made impreſſion of evill (I mean with Mr. *Baxter* the evill of pain and ſorrow) upon them, yet were not theſe ſufferings the execution of the Curſe upon them. 3 In an implyed inſinuation that we deny all evill of pain in the ſufferings of believers, ſo making them as ſtocks, and ſtones, inſenſible, or as glorified perſons, impaſſible. Which none ever held, though Mr. *Baxter* would lay it as an abſurdity upon all that diſſent from him, to make the truth which they maintein odious. Now Mr. *Baxter* is not a Child, he ſees well enough theſe abſurdities and fallacies, and doth not either thorow ignorance or inadvertency commit them. His uſe of them therefore doth inſinuate to us two things.

1 His abaſing opinion of others in the ſuperlative confidence that he hath of and in himſelf. If he thought not almoſt all others to be meer *Terræ filios*, Clods of clay in compariſon of himſelf, he would not thus ſhake out upon his very abſurdities, and groſſeſt fallacies to be treaſured up by us as Oracles, becauſ his.

2 His ſuſpending of conſcience that while he pretends unto truth, yet takes the reines by any abſurd falſe tricks utterly to ſubvert it. As for his arrogance againſt God in the Concluſion, What reaſon can be given, *&c. ut ſupra*. No marvell if he take the

* *Abhorret a ſenſu communi ut beneficat ei a quo pœnæ ſumuntur.* Cham. Panſtr. T. 3. l. 23. Cap. 6. Parag. 11. *Monſtrum judicij*, &c. *Id.* ibid. Parag. 30.

chaire to himſelf alone from thence to judge of all other Divines, when we finde him here as it were uſurping the throne of Heaven, thence to ſentence and cenſure the wiſedome of God in his proceedings. In anſwer to him I ſhall uſe no other but Mr. *Pembles* words againſt the like arrogance of the Papiſts. Such Queſtions (ſaith he) are vain and curious, proſecuted by idle and unthankfull men, who not acknowledging the riches of Gods Wiſdome and Grace, in that courſe of our redemption which God hath followed, would accuſe God of indiſcretion, for making much adoe about nothing, and teach him to go a more compendious and eaſie way to work then [his wiſdom hath choſen]. Theſe Criticiſms upon Gods glorious & wonderfull proceedings in his [adminiſtrations,] we leave to *Socinus* and *Arminius* with their followers. It is our part *ſapere ad ſobrietatem*, and to underſtand what God hath, not to tell him what he might or ſhould have done?

To the Eighth. Becauſe he knoweth his aſſertion falſe, he therefore ſaith ſomething, but conceals from us what it is, tells us that all the Scriptures and reaſons which are brought againſt his opinion, do not hit it nor hurt it, but will not let us to know one particular of all thoſe Scriptures and Reaſons that he hath heard or read urged againſt him, leſt that ſome one anſwering might manifeſt the falſhood of the aſſertion. This is ſafe diſputing, to ſpeak ſo as to leave no footing for an anſwer. Such baites may catch Froggs poſſibly, but never a Fiſh. And (as he affirmeth) neither Scriptures not Reaſons prove more then this, That our afflictions are not the rigorous execution of the Law, what Scripture or Reaſon can be given why that believers ſhall not be damned in hell together with unbelievers? For what is the rigor of the Law but the infliction of the Curſe in its utmoſt extent and extremity. But if the Saints be beaten with few ſtripes when the rebells are beaten with many, and be damned but to the uppermoſt when the other are caſt into the nethermoſt hell, then is not the Curſe of the Law executed upon them in its utmoſt rigor? If this be not to abaſe the merits of Chriſt that hath purchaſed, and abuſe the grace of God that promiſeth, and abate if not to deſtroy the hope and comfort of believers that ſhall receive (according to Mr. *Baxter*) no better priviledges then this, ſurely then nothing can do it. As for that which he addeth of a mixture of love and hatred in God when he curſeth the wicked; and of love and anger when he curſeth the godly. This is a meer *Chimæra* of his own brain; a making of

God

God to be in a commotion againſt himſelf, to carry fire in the one hand and water in the other; to fight with the right againſt the left, and with the left hand againſt the right: ſometimes the one and ſometimes the other overcoming, but of which ſide ſoever the Victory reſteth, ſtill muſt the poor believer be curſed, and when moſt under the curſe (we muſt believe Mr. *Baxter* telling us a ſtrange wonder) he is not at all under the hatred of God. An excellent diſputer to have ſtood alway at *Marcions* elbow prompting him with argument to prove this God to have been a malignant and envious God, the author of all evill to mankinde; what leſs doth Mr. *Baxter* affirm when he tells us that he curſeth his very Friends, thoſe that truſt in him, thoſe whom he hateth not, yea thoſe whom he loveth? But doth he bring no Scripture to prove all that he hath ſaid? Yes one in ſteed of all, and that as pertinent and proper to his purpoſe as a Pearl to a Swines ſnout, *Death hath loſt his ſting*, 1 Cor. 15. 55, 56. *There is no unpardoned ſin in it.* Yet when God hath pardoned every of their ſins, he will nevertheleſſe powre upon them the Curſe, when they are without, if not alſo becauſe they are without ſin, *ipſe dixit*, and I muſt be ſilent.

To the Ninth. It greeves me leſſe when I finde Mr. *Baxter* leaving the pure fountain of Scripture, ſtirring in his own element the puddle of humane art and wiſedom, then when he meddles with the word, becauſe he ſeldom toucheth it but with a defiled and defiling hand to pervert, maim, or add to it and ſo to prophane it. So that his ſin is greater in this than in the other. The place which he quotes here 1 Cor. 15. 26. ſaith not that (as he untruly alleageth) Death is not yet overcome, but onely ſaith *The laſt enemy that ſhall be deſtroyed is death*; it is overcome already though not deſtroyed. Yet not to ſtrive about words, Death is overcome, and it is not overcome, but in different reſpects. It is overcome

1 In relation to Chriſt himſelf and his naturall body, that it cannot reach or ſeize on him. Els is not Chriſt riſen from death, and *then our faith is vain.* But he is riſen in the power of the Godhead, *having looſed or diſſolved the pains* [and Chains too] *of Death, it being unpoſſible he ſhould be held by it.* Acts 2. 24. For how ſhould a power finite over-power the power of God which is infinite? Neither will any ſay that Chriſt eſcaped from the bonds of death by Treaty, but by Conqueſt. *He aſcended on high, leading captivity captive*, Eph. 4. 8. *Having ſpoyled principalities, and powers, he made open ſhew of them, triumphing over them*, Col. 2. 15. *By his death he hath*

deſtroyed not only death it ſelf, but *him alſo that had the power of death*, i. e. *the Devill*, Heb. 2. 14.

2 In relation to the myſticall body of Chriſt, the believers, it is ſo overcome that it hath in it no curſe to vomit out upon them. That was carried away in Chriſts naturall body, that this his myſticall body might be freed from it. *He took to himſelf* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *part of our fleſh and blood, that by death he might deſtroy him that hath the power of death*, i. e. *the Devill, and deliver them who through fear of death, were all their life-time ſubject to bondage*, Heb. 2. 14, 15. What was that in death that the Saints ſo feared under the Law, (before the Goſpel had fully cleered to them their liberty) but the Curſe? The Law threatned them with death as with the Curſe and vengeance of God. This made them to live all their life-time in a ſad bondage for fear of death, of the curſe and vengeance in death at the laſt. But Chriſt hath by his death delivered us from the Curſe that was in death, ſo that now we live not in fear and bondage, in expectation of death. It is but a ſweet dormitory to the Saints, in which they put off their *corruptible and dreggiſh*, that at laſt they may *put on immortall and ſpirituall bodies*, in them *to meet with Chriſt in the day of Judgement, and be for ever with him*, 1 Cor. 15. 44. 1 Theſ. 4. 17. In theſe reſpects death is overcome.

But it is not ſo overcome but that it hath its being, yea full dominion with its curſe over the wicked, and in this reſpect it is ſaid, *The laſt Enemy that ſhall be deſtroyed is death*; as will appear by reading the former verſ with this, *Chriſt muſt reign till he hath brought all his enemies under his feet. The laſt enemy*, &c. The Apoſtle here from the Authority of that Prophecy, *Pſal.* 110. 1. concludeth that Chriſt muſt *ſit at the right hand of God, having* and executing *all power in heaven and in earth, untill he hath brought all his enemies under his feet.* Here if

1 We conſider that death as the other enemies that are to be ſubdued, is ſpoken of as an Enemy to Chriſt, we muſt conclude that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh not at all of death, as a Curſe. For death is no more a Curſe to Chriſt glorified, than the other enemies wicked and reprobate men that are to be brought under his feet.

2 A reaſon is here given why death muſt be the laſt Enemy deſtroyed, *viz.* Becauſe Chriſt muſt bring *all his enemies under foot.* Now as long as there ſhall remain upon the earth enemies to Chriſt, and his Goſpel, ſucceeding one another in their generations, ſo long

long death in its fulneſſe of the curſe and wrath of God, is uſefull to ſeize on them, as the Lord Chriſt ſhall deſtroy and bring them under its power: ſo that as long as there is any other Enemy remaining, death is not to be aboliſhed in regard of its uſefulneſſe in reſpect of the other Enemies.

But when the end is come, and the enemies all deſtroyed, and no one more remaining to be ſeized on, but that all ſhall be raiſed from this firſt to be ſentenc'd unto and hurled into the ſecond death, hell and brimſtone, (I mean all the enemies of Chriſt) now death alſo it ſelf ſhall be deſtroyed, there being no further uſe of it. That this is the proper meaning of this Text a blind man may ſee, and conſequently ſee it to be ſinfully wreſted by Mr. *Baxter*, forcing it ſeemingly to prove that the Saints are yet liable to the Curſe, becauſe ſubject to death.

To his plain caſe of our Corruption, which he addeth, I have ſpoken before.

To the tenth, which is the laſt. Every one will expect to find the ſweet at the bottom, and that the laſt ſtroke ſhould drive the nail home to the very head. Attend we to it therefore conſiderately, and we ſhall find it if not the ſtrongeſt, yet the moſt portentous of all. *The whole ſtream of Scriptures* (ſaith he) *makes Chriſt to have now the ſole diſpoſing of us and of our ſufferings*; Ergo becauſe we are in Chriſts arms and under his diſpenſation, we muſt needs be liable to the Curſe. For the Scripture affirms him (ſaith he) *to have prevented the full execution of the Curſe, and to manage that which befalleth on us for our advantage and good; but no where doth it affirm that he ſuddenly delivereth us.* Which of Mr. *Baxters* admirers would not have cenſur'd it in *Bellarmin* a *moſt prodigious impudency, if not blaſphemy*, thus to father his conceits upon the holy Scriptures. If Mr. *Baxter* had found but one leaſt rivulet of that whole ſtream of Scriptures which he mentioneth to have been for his turn, would he not have directed us to it, or cited it to us? If he took the holy Scriptures for any thing els then one of his *Fathers* once termed it to Cardinal *Bembus*, *Fabulam de Chriſto*, he would not dare ſo much to ſlander, wreſt, and corrupt it. While his diſpute is wholly taken up about the Curſe to bring believers under it, he would fear that Curſe denounced againſt himſelf, *all plagues upon him that ſhall add any thing to it, and the taking away his part from the book of life, whoſoever ſhall take from it*, Rev. 22. 18, 19. what leſs doth Mr. *Baxter* in pronouncing the whole ſtream of Scriptures, to teach that which

which no drop of Scripture hath a reliſh of? is not this adding. And when the Scripture pronounceth Chriſt to *have delivered us from the curſe of the Law; that there is no condemnation*, &c. and he comes with his gloſſe, he hath delivered us from the Curſe, *i.e.* hath prevented the full execution of the Curſe. There is no condemnation, *i. e.* none is condemned to the Curſe in its full rigour, among all the beleevers; is not this to take away from the word of God, yea to enervate and emaſculate it and make it of no vigour?

And further, doth not his Arguing here tend to the abaſing, annihilating, and even un-Chriſting of Chriſt? What an abſurdity is it to think that he *who was God, and accounted it no robbery to be equall with God, ſhould in overflowing love towards us, make himſelf of no reputation, take to him the form of a Servant, humble himſelf to the death, even the death of the Croſs*, Phil. 2. 6.—8. *and himſelf bear our ſins in his own body on the Tree*, 1 Pet. 2: 24. and all to this end, that having diſabled Law and Sin from all power to Curſe without him, to purchaſe to himſelf the Monopoly of Curſing, or inflicting the Curſe upon his own friends, yea his own Body and Members, that none henceforth ſhould curſe them but from by and under him? Who but one that is ambitious to be his Vicar, would make of Chriſt ſuch a Pope? Yea how is the glory of Chriſts grace and merits veiled, nay extinguiſhed, by teaching that Chriſt is aſcended into the Heavens, and ſit down at the right hand of God, to manage the Curſe to the tormenting, yet (if Mr. *Baxter* be heard) for the advantage of his Saints on Earth?

The Scripture tels us of other and moſt glorious ends of his Reſurrection Aſcenſion and ſitting at the right hand of God, viz. to *receive a Kingdom for himſelf and thoſe that believe in him*, Lu. 19. 12, 15. *to prepare for them places and Manſions in it, that coming again he may receive them to himſelf, that where he is there may they be alſo*, John 14. 2, 3. *that being aſcended on high, and having led our captivity captive*; he may powre gifts *upon his Saints, even gifts*, greater than the whole world, That he might be a bleſſing-giver to us, that we might be *bleſſed with all ſpirituall bleſſings in heavenly places in Chriſt*, Epheſ. 1. 3. *to free us from the Curſe and condemnation, by making interceſſion for us*, Rom. 8. 34. But no where doth the Scripture make him a Curſe-monger.

But with what impudence doth he close up all that he he hath to say upon this subject in a known falshood, telling us that *the Scripture no where affirmeth that he suddenly delivers us from the curse*; when the Scripture contrarywise affirmeth that he *hath delivered us from the Law, hath delivered us from sin*, hath delivered us from the Curse, and that we *are* thus delivered already; and already is a step before suddenly. Thus abusive is he both to the Scriptures, and to the Lord Christ.

Chap. VII.

How manifoldly evill and hurtfull such sceptick and distinctionary disputes are, and how farr Mr. Baxter *and the Papists agree in the matter and form of this dispute.*

I Have been large in answering these Arguments, yet it hath proceeded not onely from my naturall slownes and uncapablenes of Concisenes, but partly also from Mr. *Baxters* purposed Concisenes, whose common slight it is here and elswhere, under a pretence of avoyding tediousnes, to leave the most precious truths hidden in corners, and onely to leave a *paint* of plausibility and probability upon the Embryons *and errors* of his own brain, in stead of bringing them openly to the tryall. And this occasioned me to be the more in length to bring forth cleerly into the light the truth that he hath hidden; and to take off the outside paint from his fancies, that they might appear in their own nature and colors. Partly also to discover the pernicious danger which lurketh in the doctrine which he hath here delivered, against which too much cannot be spoken, to prevent the taking of inconsiderate and over-credulous Christians in his snares. I shall shew my reasons why I call it pernicious doctrine, and so leave the question.

1 It is anti-scripturall and diametrically opposite to the word, as is enough manifested by that which hath been already said in the examination thereof.

2. It is Antichristian, hath sundry Popish errors, some more apertly, others more hiddenly included in it. So that when immediately before his arguments he professeth, that it is not affectation of singularity that divides him in judgement from the reformed Churches, we doubt not but he speaks truth herein; For it is to follow

low the ſtream and Clowd of Popiſh Doctors, whoſe ſophiſtry had more force upon his judgment than ever I could perceive the Word to have. Thoſe Popiſh errors then that are more openly conteined in his doctrine here are principally about Chriſts and mans ſatisfactions made to God for mans ſinns; in which as the Papiſts ſo Mr. *Baxter* will have man to bear a ſhare with Chriſt, that the glory may not be wholly the Lords. And here in ſundry points Mr. *Baxter* ſpeaketh the very ſame things, though not altogether in the ſame words with the Papiſts. I ſhall in theſe ſeverall points, lay down briefly the doctrine of the Papiſts firſt, and then compare Mr. *Baxters* with it, that the Coherence betwixt them may be cleerly ſeen. The Papiſts opinions I ſhall truly ſet forth to you, (though briefly) as they themſelves expreſs themſelves in the Councell of *Trent. Seſſ.* 6. *Cap.* 14. 16. & *Seſſ.* 14. *Cap.* 8, 9. and *Bellar:* in his two books *de Purgatorio, & lib.* 4. *de Pœnitentia*, and by ſundry other of their own Writers.

1 They hold that although Chriſt hath by his death and merit ſatisfied the Law and Juſtice of God for the fault of our ſinns in offending Gods Juſtice and violating his holy Law, ſo that God is no more at enmity with but reconciled to them which truly repent and beleeve, hath fully pardoned their ſinn, and forgiven their offences for Chriſts ſake: yet hath neither Chriſt given nor God taken full ſatisfaction for the puniſhment, but that after the fault is pardoned, God may and will inflict puniſhment upon the offender. In this and the reſt points of ſatisfaction they give this generall rule, that Chriſt hath undertaken for us onely that which we could not do for our ſelves, and ſatisfied for us ſo far onely as it was unpoſſible for us to make ſatisfaction for our ſelves. As for that which by doing or ſuffering was in our power to accompliſh for our ſelves, that he hath left to be (without his preventing us) accompliſhed by us. But in this Caſe, ſay they, It was unpoſſible for man to undertake any work any ſuffering ſo noble & worthy as might ſtand in equipoiſe with the offending of ſo infinite a Majeſtie, and ſo to ſatisfie Gods Juſtice for the fault. This therfore Chriſt hath done and God hath accepted from Chriſt in our behalf. But it was poſſible for man to ſatisfie (at leaſt in part) for the puniſhment which the juſtice and law of God exact for the offence committed. This therefore is in part left to us to ſatisfie; and after he hath forgiven the fault, doth notwithſtanding inflict upon us the puniſhment for the ſatisfying of his law and juſtice. This they go about to prove by

by the example of Gods dealing with *Moses* and *Aaron* when they had sinned against him, he forgave freely their fault and offence, nevertheless called them exactly to a reckoning about the punishment; was in perfect friendship with them again, yet would not abate them an ace of the punishment which he had threatened to them, they must dye in the Wildernes and never enter into the land that flowed with milk and hony. The like they instance in *David* about his sin in reference to *Bathsheba* and *Uriah*; The Lord forgave the offence, *The Lord hath put away thy sin*, (saith the Prophet) *thou shalt not surely dye*, 2 Sam. 12, 13. Nevertheles in reference to the punishment, *David* shall smoke for it. *The child shall dye*, *the sword shall never depart from his house*, &c. so that *David* shall rue it to his very dying day. Other Scriptures and reasons they bring which would be over tedious to insert.

Compare we now Mr. *Baxters* doctrine with theirs. *Thes.* 7. he tells us, That *Christ Jesus being fully furnished for this work* [*of Mediation*] *by his Fathers and his own will, first undertook and afterward discharged mans debt by suffering what the Law did threaten, and the offender was unable to bear.* And *Thes.* 8. *That the Father so fully accepted the satisfaction, that by way of reward to Christ that gave it, he hath delivered all things into his hands, and given him all power in heaven and in earth, and made him Lord both of the dead and living.* Yet *Thes.* 9th, addeth that, *It was not the intent of either the Father or the Son, that by this satisfaction the offenders should be immediately delivered from the whole Curse of the Law, and freed from the evill which they had brought upon themselves, but some part must be executed upon soul and body*, &c. And this he goes about by his ten Arguments which we have examined, to prove of the beleevers themselves, that they are liable to the punishment and Curse of the Law, to bear it in part even to death it self, and that though there be no unpardoned sin for which the curse as the curse is inflicted upon them. Let any discreet man here judge if there be the least haires breadth betwixt Mr *Baxter* and a Papist according to the Councell of *Trent*, i. e. the worst Papist. The rule of both about satisfaction is the same. Christ hath done and suffered for us what we could not do and suffer for our selves say the Papists; Christ hath suffered for us what the Law did threaten, and we were unable to bear, saith Mr. *Baxter*, implying that whatsoever we can bear must yet be inflicted upon us. For this satisfaction, the fault is forgiven, saith *Bellarmine*. By means of this satisfaction there remains no *unpardoned Sin*, saith Mr. *Baxter* [*viz.* upon beleevers.] Yet

Pag. 71. *Arg.* 8.

ſay both when the ſin is forgiven the puniſhment, curſe, and penalty of the Law muſt be ſuffered. Here is noble mercy and forgiveneſs, to pardon a man his fault, and to pronounce with *Pilate* I finde no fault in him, and forthwith to whip and hang him for no fault. Such divine mercy and Juſtice do theſe white ſonnes of the Pope aſcribe to the Father of Mercies, and to his dear Son the purchaſer and fluce of all Mercies. Touching the doctrine it ſelf I have anſwered Mr. *Baxters* Arguments. But as to theſe arguments of the Papiſts, I paſs them by, not having undertaken to anſwer them here any farther than Mr. *Baxter* is their mouth to diſpute for them.

2 The Papiſts teach (according to the forementioned rule) that Chriſt hath in part alſo ſatisfied for the puniſhment of ſin, as well as wholly for the fault. And as far as Chriſt hath born and ſatisfied, ſo far we are freed from the puniſhment. But Chriſt hath ſatisfied onely for the infinite & eternall puniſhment, leaving us to bear the finite and temporary puniſhments and curſe of the Law, or to ſatisfie for it our ſelves. So that by their doctrine, Chriſt hath not at all by his merits freed us from the ſubſtance of the Curſe a penalty and vengeance of the Law, but onely from the boundles meaſure and endles duration thereof. What ſaith Mr. *Baxter* to this? Chriſt (ſaith he) in reference to the puniſhment of ſin, *hath ſuffered ſo much of what the Law did threaten, as we our ſelves were unable to bear. Theſ.* 7. leaving to us to bear the greateſt Curſes of the Law, but not in their full rigor, *and in their rigorous execution thereof.* p. 69. Arg. 3. & p. 71. Arg. 8. What is this rigor and rigorous execution of the puniſhment and curſe of the Law, but the execution of the ſame in its infinite meaſure and endles duration, which could not be (as he confeſſeth) born *without the offenders everlaſting undoing. Theſ.* 6. And thus he with the Papiſts makes the ſatisfaction which Chriſt hath given to his Fathers Juſtice, effectuall to deliver us not from the ſubſtance of the Curſe and vengeance, but onely from the extent of its meaſure and duration. So that if I underſtand my mother language, and the equipollency of terms and words therein, there is but the name, and a Cardinals hat that puts a difference between a *Bellarmine* and a *Baxter* in this point, both ſpeak not onely the *Tantundem*, but the *Idem*, the very ſelf ſame thing in matter & ſubſtance, to the diminution, yea degrading of the merits of Chriſt, to make way to ſet up mans ſatisfactions parallell with if not ſupereminent and above Chriſts. With whom if I ſhould enter into a Conteſt upon this Argument, and dared as they to make the Scripture a meer

Kick-

Kickshose, without substance and authority, under the Charm of distinctions to be formed, conformed, deformed unto and into any sense at pleasure, I could upon more probable grounds and with more plausible reasons argue that Christ hath satisfied for, and we by his satisfaction are delivered from the finite and temporary part of the Curse and vengeance onely, but are left to bear for ever the infinite and eternall torment thereof in hell: than they bring for our deliverance onely from the temporary and not from the eternall. Because (according to Mr. *Baxter*) Christ suffered the temporary and finite pains onely for us, not the eternall, but left these (as it more probably seems) to be suffered by our selves for our selves. But as Mr. *Baxter* will not learn from Christ himself to oppose the Majesty & power of the Word against Sophistry, so neither dare I learn to oppose his Sophistry against Christ and his Word.

3 The Papists teach that those punishments which come upon Christians unavoydably by the threat of the Law, for the transgression of the Law, *viz.* the temporall evills that are incident to their souls and bodies in this life, as sicknes, sorrow, loss of friends, credit or estates, poverty, tribulations, persecutions, trouble of Conscience, &c. if they be suffered willingly and with patience, are satisfactions to God for sin; but if unpatiently and unwillingly, they are Gods revenge upon us. So much the holy *Councell of Trent* doth even in expres words affirm and determine. What doth Mr. *Baxter* say in conformity or contradiction to this assertion? He tells us that all temporall evills do necessarily invade beleevers, and that by the force and Curse of the Law, that when God sanctifieth the same to them, he doth not thereby take away their naturall evill or their Curse, but onely produceth by it as by an occasion a greater good. *What reason can be given why God should not do us all that good* (*viz.* which the Orthodox Divines attribute to his sanctified Chastisements) *without our sufferings, which now he doth by them*, were there not *sin and wrath and law in them*. Sure he could better us by easier means. *They are managed by Christ to our advantage and good.* These are Mr. *Baxters* words, *Pag.* 69, 70, 72. *Arg.* 2, 3, 4, 7, 10. Let us a little examine them. When we affirm that these sufferings as they befall beleevers, are not from the Law as a Curse, but sweet Chastisements of Gods love, by which he mortifieth the flesh, increaseth their self-denyall, Conformeth them to Christ, as well in his sufferings as in his graces and doings, exerciseth and quickeneth all the gifts of his grace in them, Crucifieth the world to them and them to the

world; and being in diſpute with Papiſts, mention many other precious ends and effects of his Chaſtiſements: Mr. *Baxter* Comes in with his Tuſh at all this, *Arg.*7. Cannot God do us all this good (ſaith he) without our ſufferings, and better us by an eaſier means? What then? [Doubtles] there is ſin and wrath and law in theſe ſufferings. What can he mean by this, but that firſt there is our ſin as the merit of all theſe ſufferings, and ſecondly, that God in executing them takes ſatisfaction from them and upon them for his law violated and his juſtice offended? Let any man that hath not divorced his reaſon from him through prejudice, pick out any other meauing of his words, or deny his words in this meaning to be heterodox and Popiſh. And when he ſaith that God doth by theſe ſufferings produce a greater good [to beleevers than their ſufferings bring evill upon them] *Arg.* 4. And that they are managed, to our advantage and good, what means he by this advantage and good? Not our purifying and bettering, &c. as we hold, For this as we have ſeen, he ſhakes off as a ſingleſoled ſuppoſition, with a kinde of Apage. Nor any other good that his front hath yet taken boldnes to expreſs, for ſpeaking thereof ſo oft in generall, he would not have been ſo ſhie to ſpeciallize it for our edification and comfort, if there were any in it. It muſt be therefore ſuch a good and advantage, that though he would have us know, yet he will not ſpeak it out plainly, leaſt his tongue and teeth ſhould bewray him to be a profeſſed Papiſt, before ſuch time as he hath Phariſeelike, &c. depraved others that are unwary, and made them worſe than himſelf, *Matt.* 23. 15. And what ſhould that be, but that God takes ſatisfaction to his juſtice by his judgments upon them, here, that they may not have, or may have the leſs to ſatisfie for, in hell or in Purgatory? In this therefore as in the two former points I take him expreſſing himſelf an adopted ſonne of the ghoſtly Fathers of *Trent*.

4. The Papiſts hold that there is a Purgatory, which they deſcribe to be a priſon as hot and full of the ſame materiall fire and flames as hell it ſelf: into which the ſouls of Chriſtians after this life, are caſt to ſatisfie Gods juſtice for all their veniall ſins that they have not made ſatisfaction for in this life by ſuffering or doing; and being once caſt into this priſon they cannot come forth out of the torment, untill they have paid the utmoſt farthing of their debt, *i. e.* untill they have ſuffered ſo much as may counterpoiſe to a very grain, the ſinns whereof they dye unpardoned. This they prove by

by many undeniable Arguments, specially by the testimony of many good souls that have obteined a dispensation to come thence with their bosoms so full of fire as of flesh and bones, to tell them so. Doth Mr. *Baxter* joyn with them in this opinion also? Soft and fair, There is skill in daubing; first he will try how this Tractate will take; if according to his minde, probably we shall have a second part, and therein he may tell us plainly his jndgment in this and many other of his mysteries that here he leaves obscure and ambiguous. In the interim it pleaseth him not to deliver his minde herein in words at length, but in dark and uncertain figures. Yet joyn we together what he saith here and there in parcells, and somwhat may be made or at least conjectured of it. First then he telleth us that some part of the Curse must be executed upon beleevers, *i.e.* upon the whole man, the soul as well as the body. *Thes.* 9. 2 That untill the day of Resurrection and of Judgement, all the effects of sin and law and wrath will not be removed from them. *pag.* 74. Therefore thirdly what he will not [doth not at least] say of any of their former sufferings, he saith of death, That there is no unpardoned sin in it which shall procure further judgment, and so no hatred in it, though there be anger. A glorious privilege no doubt! such as according to our usuall proverb a man may find at Billingsgate for a box on the ear from the worst of men that he meets with. When a man hath in revengefull fury persecuted his hated nighbour with all the strokes and stormes of wrath and mischief, and after many years persecution, hath at last slaughtered him, and trampled his dead Corps into the mire and dust; now at last he ceaseth from hatred, & is but angry with his poor reliques, forgives him all the rest, when he can do no more to him, and forgivenes can do him no good. Such tender mercies of Cruelty (as the wise man terms them, *Pro.* 12. 10.) doth Mr. *Baxter* here ascribe unto God in his gracious dealings with beleevers for Christs sake: *viz.* to persecute them with all the strokes of his wrath, and all the Curses of the law all their life time, sparing neither their body nor soul, and at last with great indignation to destroy them and trample their bodies into the earth, dust, and rottennes, yea and their souls whither he list, and under what torment he list, and after this (so remarkeable is his love) he will hate them no more, but be angry with them still. When they are dead and can offend no more, and God hath inflicted upon them all his judgments that he can inflict no more, now their sins shall be so pardoned that they shall suffer no more, no more

Pag. 71. *Arg.* 8.

more than all which they already ſuffer. Who denies this to be the very quinteſſence of mercy and ſpirits of love when Mr. *Baxter* hath ſo defined it, and held it forth to us as the moſt Celeſtiall comfort that we ſhall finde in death? There is (ſaith he) no unpardoned ſin in the death of beleevers that ſhall procure further judgement. Where note 1 that he ſaith not ſimply and abſolutely that there is no unpardoned ſin upon the Saints now dead and buryed: but no ſin ſo unpardoned, that it ſhould bring further judgement than that which is already upon them. And 2 That when he denyeth that their ſin ſhall bring any further judgement upon them, he doth not deny but rather imply their ſins to be yet ſtill unpardoned as to the holding thoſe judgements upon them that are already inflicted. A comfort that the Devills and reprobates in hell ſhall not want after the very day of judgment in the midſt of their flames; That there is none of their ſinns ſo unpardoned as that it ſhould bring any further judgment upon them. But put we all together, 1 That the beleever muſt bear the Curſe, even the whole man, in body and ſoule alſo. 2 That he ſhall not be delivered from this curſe in ſoul and body untill the reſurrection. 3 That although death puts him into a freedom from further judgments, yet it doth not at all deliver him from thoſe that at death are inflicted upon ſoul and body. How ſhall we now make up the matter? If the whole man both ſoul and body muſt ſuffer and not be wholly freed untill the reſurrection, this is not fulfilled in the ſuffering of the body alone. If the ſoul alſo untill then muſt ſuffer, then is it not forthwith upon its ſeperation from the body exalted to Heaven, for there, is no ſuffering, no affliction. Neither doth it ſuffer in hell, for Mr. *Baxter* exempteth thence all that perſevere in the Faith (according to his definition of faith) untill death. Where and whence then ſhall it ſuffer but in and from the fire of Purgatory? And ſo there is no unpardoned ſin upon beleevers after death that can procure to them any further judgment beyond this. If Mr. *Baxter* meaneth not ſo, it is his fault to write with ſo much ambiguity, and ſo little plainnes and perſpicuity, as to toll us on to a ſtrong Conjecture that he meaneth ſo, and is in this as in the reſt apoſtatized to the Papiſts.

5 I might add alſo here that he ſeemes to joyn with the Papiſts in holding beleevers in an uncertainty of their ſalvation all their life long. It is conſiderable that neither in his Aphoriſm, nor in the whole explication therof, nor in all his arguments by which he goeth

goeth about to prove beleevers under the Curſe, doth he once name any pardon of ſin, or freedom from further judgment, which they attain untill after death, and then when they have perſevered to the end, and dyed in Chriſt, now he mentions and affirms it. What doth this argue but that he would (with the Papiſts) have men to hope well, but to be ſtill uncertain without any aſſurance of Faith or certainty of their perſeverance, and future glory untill their very laſt gaſp? But becauſe from meer Negatives no affirmative can be regularly and ſoundly deduced; I leave this but as probable, and conclude it not as certain. *Arg.* 8. *p.* 71.

We have found Mr. *Baxters* diſpute here to be firſt againſt Scripture; 2 Antichriſtian and wholly Popiſh in ſeverall points. There are many allegations more wherewith it may be juſtly charged, *viz.* that,

3 It is ſcandalous to the Grace and Mercy and Love of God that are the moſt ſweet and amiable of all his Attributes. So doth he paint out terror in the very Love and Grace of God, and Cruelty in his tender mercies; making flames of fury to break out from the very bowels of his Compaſſion, that poor ſouls beleeving what he ſaith will be apt to fly from God as from a Satan, and from his Goſpel diſpenſations as from death and hell it ſelf. When they hear him to be ſo bloudy, to take delight in curſing, cruſhing, rending, taring, and tormenting in ſoul and body, unto death and after death, his own ſonnes and daughters, and that under a profeſſion of grace and love to them, what difference can they conceive to be between ſuch a God, and the Devill? If there be ſuch bitternes in his love, who will deſire the leaſt draughts thereof? If his armes of embracing be ſuch Lions pawes, who will not ſhunn all union all drawing nigh to him? ſo doth he ſcandalize Gods love, &c. making it terrible, (which is amiablenes and life it ſelf) that none might deſire him.

4 It is ſlanderous to the juſtice of God; 1 By accuſing it there to inflict the curſe, wrath, and judgements, where he imputeth no ſin. 2 By charging it to receive ful ſatisfaction for our debt from Chriſt our ſurety, and afterward when all is paid, to require ſatisfaction from us too. A piece of injuſtice ſo odious to the light of nature it ſelf, that Mr. *Baxter* would account him a prodigie of Nature, a Devillized man that ſhould ſo do: yet hath the face to charge the moſt righteous God, whoſe wayes are all equall, yea equity it ſelf, therewith.

5 It

5 It is injurious to Christ and his Mediation. Charging him and it with insufficiency. With the want (I mean) either of insufficient merit to free us from the whole curse and wrath of God, because he could not do it, orwant of sufficient love to us that having all power given him in heaven and earth, yet will not do it. But in both these the Scripture testifieth Christ to be all-sufficient, without the least defect either of merit, or love to us, that in the infinitenes of his merit he hath purchased all, and by the infinitenes of his love he dispenseth this liberty in the fulnes of it to us, Therefore is Mr. *Baxter* ungratefully injurious to our blessed Saviour in denying it and arguing against it.

6 It tends to the advancing of mans vain-glory and boasting, in being at least in part a self-saviour, that his satisfactions have wrought with the Lord Christs in the procurement of his Justification and salvation. This by the sequele of this work appears to be the main thing to which Mr. *Baxter* driveth. For yeelding himself up to be the Disciple of men, to see and judge onely by the light of mans reason, he seems to me to be so left of God destitute of his Spirit, that he can see no farther than a meer naturall man in spirituall things; and so following the letter and scarce the letter without the Spirit of the word, he can think of no other way to happines but that which the very instinct of nature suggesteth, namely a mans own willing, running, and procurements. To this end he laies a foundation here of humane satisfaction by sufferings, perceiving well that if mans suffering of the curse of the Law be once granted to be effectuall by way of satisfaction to purge the soul from sin, then much more the righteousnes of workes done in obedience and conformity to the Law, by the help of the Spirit, will and must be granted to be more powerfull to the same end. Therefore seeks he thus to depress the grace of God and merits of Christ, that upon the ruines thereof he might erect a Temple dedicated to mans righteousnes.

7 It subverteth all the joy and consolation of Christians, which the Holy Ghost requireth of them in their sufferings from Christ or for Christs sake. How can we according to the precept of Christ, *Rejeyce and be exceeding glad, when we suffer*, Matth. 5. 12. And with *Paul*, *Glory in tribulation*, Rom. 5. 3. and *Rejoyce in our sufferings*, Col. 1. 24. And after the rule of *James*, *Account it all joy when we fall into many temptations*, Jam. 1. 2. If these be the curse of the Law, the effects of Gods wrath and heavie displeasure? Can a good childe rejoyce

and

nd glory in his fathers anger, and in the curses and strokes of his fathers wrath which he hath justly deserved? It is enough to add despair and death to the sorrow of the Saints in their afflictions, to possesse their Consciences with an apprehension that all comes from their fathers wrath, and hath the curse upon it.

8 It holds poor Christians upon a rack of torment, and under the spirit of intolerable bondage all their life time. For let Mr. *Baxter* though he were sworn against Christ to Antichrist, deny if he can that when the Apostle, *Gal.* 3. 10. saith; *As many as are of the works of the Law are under the Curse*; his meaning to be that they are in the state and under the power of damnation, or that the curse and damnation are not in Scripture phrase the same thing. I know he will not deny it, least he should declare himself to haue taken at once his farewell of divine truth, and of naturall reason also. If then to be under the curse is to be under damnation, then by affirming beleevers to be under the Curse, he affirmes them to be under damnation, & consequently them that are in Christ to be so much the children of wrath and hell as the very reprobates.

9 It inureth upon Christ a brand of evill which St *James* pronounceth detestable in a wicked man. What, that *out of the same mouth should proceed blessing and cursing*, saith he? Yet Mr. *Baxter* makes the same Christ, at the same time, to blesse and to curse, to absolve and to sentence, to save and to damn the same person. *James* 3. 9, 10, 11.

10 Let Mr. *Baxter* consider whether while he labours so vehemently to fasten the curse upon them whom God *hath blessed with faithfull Abraham*, Gal. 3. 9. He doth not pluck the curse upon himself which God hath denounced, *Gen.* 12. 3. *I will bless him that blesseth thee, and curse him that curseth thee.*

A word more I shall add (by way of digression) to some Ministers, who by a faulty inadvertency, speak in this point almost the same things with Mr. *Baxter*, though in the Article of Justification they wholly dissent from him. It hath filled my spirit with sadness to hear not onely in the Pulpits of the Country, but of the City of *London*, pronounced by the Mouths of some in great esteem both for piety and Learning; *That to say God doth not punish his Saints for their sinns, is flat Antinomism*: and affirmed, that *the afflictions of beleevers are punishments for their sin.* I beseech these men to Consider whom they here explode as Antinomians? whether besides the Apostles and Fathers of the Primitive Church, they do not brand all

the reformed Churches, and their Champions againſt the Papiſts with this ignominy? Whether there be any one Article of Chriſtian Religion, that hath been more ſtoutly defended by theſe againſt the Papiſts, than this which heat of zeal without knowledg (or Conſideration at leaſt) hath of late Called Antinomian? Let them produce any beſides the Socinian and Arminian Sophiſters that have ſtumbled at this doctrine as offenſive. I beſeech theſe men to read one *Chamier* at leaſt, *Panſtr. Tom.* 3. *lib.* 23. the ſix firſt Chapters, where this queſtion is not onely handled at large, but alſo the Arguments of the Proteſtants (who are alſo named *Cap.* 1.) particularized, and all the objections of the Papiſts againſt thoſe Arguments Confuted: and the Papiſts Arguments to prove the Contrary aſſertion anſwered. The queſtion being thus ſtated, *Utrùm puniantur fidelium ſcelera? & utrùm dura quæ ijs immittit Deus, ſint peccatorum pœnæ?*

So much by way of anſwer to Mr. *Baxters* reſolving of his third queſtion. There remain yet three queſtions more; *viz.*

Bix. 4. *Whether it be not a wrong to the Redeemer, that the people whom he hath ranſomed, be not immediately delivered* [from *the Curſe*]?

5. *Whether it be any wrong to the redeemed themſelves?*

6. *How long will it be till all the Curſe be taken off beleevers, and Redemption have attained its full effect?*

The two former of theſe queſtions, are ſawcy, arrogant, and proud. In their propoſall, Mr. *Baxter* acts the part of Satan in queſtioning and accuſing Gods Juſtice. In his anſwer to them he takes upon himſelf to act the part of an Angel, to be an Apologiſt to plead for the defence of Gods juſtice. 2 Gods juſtice is not, cannot be injurious to any, ſo that God needs not an Apologiſt to plead his cauſe; if he needed, his wiſdome would not make choice of his accuſer to be his Advocate. 3 Mr. *Baxter* if he would have dealt ingenuouſly, ſhould have put the queſtions whether himſelf be not injurious; 1 To God and his Chriſt; 2 To the redeemed by denying their deliverance from and affirming their proſtrate bondage under the Curſe, and not to have queſtioned whether his ſlandering of Gods juſtice hath made God faulty. And then he ſhould have received an anſwer to his reſolving of the queſtions. But as he puts the queſtions I reject his reſolving of them as unworthy of an anſwer. Onely by the way I ſay, that what he ſpeaks in anſwer to his

his own questions is all meerly sophisticall and fallacious. The three first reasons that he brings to prove that Christ is not wronged by the not delivering of his ransomed ones, being things in question not proved by Mr. *Baxter*, therefore in arguing from them he doth (as it is usuall with him) beg the principle. The fourth reason is not *ad idem*, but so farr from the question as *London* from *Barwick*, that there is no hope they will ever meet together. The question speaking of beleevers, The reason, of Christs dealing with the world to make them beleevers. And the same is evident in what he saith to the fifth question also. The sixth question he thus resolveth;

Bax. *The last enemy to be overcome is death*, 1 Cor. 15. 26. *This enemy will be perfectly overcome at the Resurrection. Then also shall we be perfectly acquitt from the charge of the Law, and accusation of Satan: Therefore not till the day of Resurrection and judgment will all the effects of sin and law and wrath be perfectly removed.*

If in the conclusion he mean the effects of sin and law and wrath shall not be removed from the world untill the resurrection; he speaketh truth, but *nihil ad rem*, far from the question which speaketh onely of beleevers. If he mean of them that the Curse shall not be removed. I have answered it before, and the Scriptures here brought to prove it, and will not here *Actum agere*.

Chap. VIII.

Whether Beleevers are under the Law as a Covenant of works? The Negative proved. Mr. Baxters *ambiguities and mentall reservations in stating the question, and asserting the affirmative. The Law not repealed to any, but exauthorated to beleevers, having inflicted its whole curse upon them in Christ.*

Mr. *Baxter* had ended, but he had not finished his dispute about the Curse upon beleevers. He did but Parthian or ram-like, go backward and decline a little, to return with the greater force. Or as an Actor upon the stage, withdraw and make his *exit*, to put on a new dress, in which to appear again forthwith to act a second part. So doth Mr. *Baxter* decline the dispute in one Aphorism

and its explication, (which I alſo ſhall paſs by without exception againſt it) and then he returns to proſecute the ſame diſpute afreſh yet in another dreſs of words, that it might ſeem to be a reſolving or determining of another queſtion. That was, whether beleevers remain under the Curſe of the Law? This, whether they remain under the Law as it threateneth and curſeth? And between these two queſtions who ſeeth not ſo vaſt a difference, as is between an arrow in the quiver, and an arrow out of the quiver? within and without the quiver, it is the ſame arrow ſtill. Yet let us attend to him ſtating the queſtion (which anon we ſhall examine.) The reſult of it is thus.

Bax. *That the Morall Law (not in its directive uſe but) as it is a Covenant of works, is ſtill in force to threaten and bring the Curſe upon beleevers, in caſe they do in any thing tranſgreſs the Law.*

This he undertakes to make good, pronouncing it inconſiderateneſs to aſſert the contrary. *Theſ.* 11. *p.* 78. *& explic. p.* 79. *& explic. of Theſ.* 12. *p.* 82.

Here before we meddle any further with Mr. *Baxter*, let us examine what the Holy Ghoſt in Scripture ſpeaketh to this point. *Ye are not under the Law, but under Grace*, ſaith th'Apoſtle to believers. *Rom.* 6.14. I conceive there is no one Chriſtian upon earth that hath his head unbiaſſed with ſophiſticall fallacies and falſhoods, but takes the words in the ſame ſimple and clear ſenſe wherein the Holy Ghoſt delivers them, *viz.* That we are no more under the Law, as a Covenant of Works, when we have once attained by faith to be under the Covenant of Grace. But a very thunder-bolt againſt Mr. *Baxter* and his Aſſertion is that, *Gal.* 5. 3, 4. *I teſtifie to every one that is circumciſed, that he is debtor to do the whole Law. Chriſt is become of none effect to you whoſoever of you are juſtified by the Law, ye are fallen from Grace.* From theſe words muſt needs be deduced theſe Concluſions.

1 That to be under the Law, and to be under Grace, are contraries, and do exclude either the other, ſo that it is impoſſible for the ſame perſon at the ſame time to be under both together. If but circumciſed, if at all under the Law, ye have (ſaith the Apoſtle) made Chriſt of none effect to you, ye are fallen from grace, and conſequently if at all in Chriſt, yee are not in the leaſt part under the Law, but free from the domination and Curſe thereof.

2 That whoſoever yieldeth himſelf to be under the Law as a Covenant

Covenant of Works; in the least part hath his justification or damnation depending upon his perfect or unperfect keeping of the whole Law, so saith th' Apostle, if but circumcised, &c. ye are debtors to keep the whole Law: How debtors, *viz.* If ever ye will be justified and saved to keep it perfectly, if ye fail but once, to be damned for ever.

3 That whosoever affirmeth (whether he be a *Bellarmine* or a *Baxter*) believers to be under the Law as a Covenant of Works, the same by necessary consequence denyeth all actuall efficacy of Christs death, that ever any soul was or shalbe saved by his mediation, and affirmeth all the Saints that have been, are, or shalbe, to be damned for ever. For if at all under the Law, then not at all under grace or in Christ; but they must stand or fall according as they do or not do the whole Law, which none doth, *ergo*, all must perish. The same also may be gathered from *Gal.* 3. 10. but I have touched upon it before.

A noble Aphorist ye will acknowledg, declaring a greater desire to bring the Saints under the Curse and damnation, then there is force in his Disputes to prove them to be under it.

These Scriptures might suffice to satisfie every judgment, that believers are not under the Law. Yet I shall mention some few more to shew the copiousnes of the word in this point, that there might be no doubting in this point, *Rom* 7. 1—6, the Holy Ghost doth make out this truth as clear as the light. *The Law* (saith he) *hath dominion over a man* [onely] *during life, as the husband hath power over his wife.* Let either the husband or wife dye, the law or power which the husband had over the wife dyeth also. If the wife dye he hath no power over the soul or ashes of his dead wife, to exact under any penalty, obedience from them. If the wife be survivor, she is no more bound to the dead ashes of her husband, to fear either command or wrath thence, but is wholly at liberty. So also stands the relation between the Law and believers. The Law in the height of its authority had power to inflict death but once upon man; this death have believers suffered in Christ, therefore *are dead to the Law by the body of Christ, have done their Law, and suffered all that the Law had to inflict upon sinners, in the body*, or humane nature of Christ suffering for them; so that they are dead to the Law, so far without the lists of further punishment or terrour of the Law, as the Felon or Murtherer that is condemned, hanged, dead and buried, is free from further punishment, by the Law of the Land.

Yea

Yea the Law also is dead to them, having spent it's sting and strength, and life also on the naturall body of Christ, and is thereby disabled for ever to re-assume the same against the mysticall body or any member thereof: So that they are [fully] *delivered from the Law.*

All this doth th'Apostle speak out at the full in that place, and no lesse in *Gal.* 3. 24, 25. *The Law was our School-master unto or until Christ,* &c. *But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a School-master.* This also he illustrateth, *Gal.* 4. 1, &c. by a similitude, likening the Church before Christs coming to *an Heir in his Minority, by his fathers will put under Tutors and Governors, so that though he be Lord of all, yet differs nothing from a servant, but is under his Tutors ferule and rod also,* to be constrained with fear, when love becomes ineffectuall to move him to his duty: such was the condition of the Church while in its minority and feeblenes of spiritual knowledge, the Sun of righteousnes not being yet risen fully to enlighten them with the understanding of their liberty and glorious prerogatives. During this time though they were Lords of all, yet because of the weaknes of their knowledg they were kept Servant-like under hard Masters, under the Commands and threats of the Law: but resembling the Church under the Gospel, to the same heir in his maturity of age, now entred into the possession of his heritage, and become rather Lord of his Tutors and Governours, then any way subject or servile to their authority, gently and generously accepting their wholsom Counsels, but disdaining so to subject to their authority, as to be brought under the rod of their power any more.

So also *Gal.* 5. 13, 18, 23. speaking of them that had been *called to the liberty of the Gospel, believing in Christ, walking in the Spirit, and bringing forth the fruits of the Spirit,* concludeth of them, that *they are not under the Law, that against such there is no Law.* And 2 *Cor.* 3. 11. cals the Law (as a Covenant of works) *that which was done away,* as he doth the Gospel (as a Covenant of Grace) *that which remaineth.* Yea that the case might be so plain, that no Jesuiticall distinctions might pervert it, the Holy Ghost at once concludeth, both negatively that believers are not under the terrours of the Law at all; and affirmatively that they are wholly and onely under the sweet dispensation of grace, *Heb.* 12. 18——24. *Ye are not come to the Mount,* &c. *burning with fire, nor unto blacknes, and darknesse, and tempest, nor to the words and Covenants which could not be heard*

heard and born, and to the terrible voyce which made Moses himself exceedingly to fear and quake. [These are the things done away in reference to believers] *But ye are come to Mount Sion, to the City of the living God, the heavenly Hierusalem,* &c. to all the prerogatives and privileges of the Kingdome of Grace.

So also in the Epistle to the *Galathians.* There are *two Covenants* (saith the Holy Ghost) *the one from Mount Sinai* (where the Law was given) *which gendereth to bondage,* [the other from] *Hierusalem which is above and is free, the mother of us all,* and concludes at last of all believers, negatively, *that they are not the children of the Bond-woman,* i. e. under the Covenant of works, and *affirmatively, But of the free,* i. e. under the Covenant of Grace, *Gal.* 4. 24, 26, 31. Hence is that bold triumphant challenge of the Apostle, *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? it is God that justifieth: who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that hath dyed, yea rather that is risen again, who sitteth at the right hand of God and maketh intercession for us.*

Having laid down these two positions as truths undeniable, that Christ hath effectually satisfied, and as a perfect Mediator sits at the right hand of God, making intercession for believers: And that God thereupon justifieth them: He now boldly challengeth earth and hell: who shall charge them? who shall condemn them? Yea his interrogations bear the force of strong negations, as if he had said, None can effectually charge much less condemn them, yea none dares to attempt it, no not one, not sin, nor Satan the Lords Enemies, much less the Law which is just and conformed to the will of God.

Collect we together now but some short notions of these Scriptures, what the Holy Ghost concludeth in them and by them, that believers are not under the Law, that it is an apostacy from Christ, from grace, to put themselves in the least part under the Law as a Covenant of works; that they are dead to the Law, that the Law is dead to them, that they are delivered from the Law, are no more under it, were servants to it, but are now free from it, there is no Law against them, that it is done away from having any domination over them, that they are departed from the Lawes terrours, and come to the Gospels celestial previledges; are not under the Covenant of Works, but under the Covenant of Grace, have the originall of their present condition not from *Sinai* but from the supernall *Hierusalem*, are sons not of the bond-woman but of the free,

free, that there is none that can condemn them, none that can justly lay any thing to their charge. Let any man now that beleiveth there is a Holy Ghost, and that the Holy Ghost speaketh in the Scriptures; judge whether it be possible for the wisedom of the Holy Ghost himself, which is infinite, to give his testimony more fully, cleerly or plainly to this assertion, that believers are not under the cursing power of the Law, or under the Law as a Covenant of works? whether this truth hath not from these testimonies of Scripture a sufficient fortification raised about it against all Jesuits and Devils. Yet Mr. *Baxter* with horn and hoof, tooth and nail assaults it, partly by secret minings, and partly by open batteries to subvert it. I shall hold out his slights, in his own words.

E. Thes. 11. *Not that Christ doth absolutely null or repeal the old Covenant hereby* [viz. by constituting a New Covenant *Thes.* 10.] *But he superaddeth this as the onely possible way of life. The former still continueth to command, prohibite, promise and threaten: so that the sins even of the Justified, are still breaches of that Law, and are threatened and cursed thereby.*

This is his first plea, his dispute in generall, against the before proved Assertion.

The Aphorism consisteth of meer obscurities, ambiguities, equivocations, and mentall reservations in words and phrases, wherein the Aphorist hides himself that he may smite and not be smitten; speaking in words of a double and doubtfull sense, that he may beguile the unwary in the sense wherein he would be understood, that he may deceive; and yet in case that by them which are wise and wary he be called *ad partes*, to answer for his fallacious subtlety, he might fly for shelter to the other sense that he might not appear to be a deceiver.

And first the word *nulling*, yea the phrase *absolutely nulling*, is ambiguous, equivocall, and fallacious. A thing, a law, a covenant may be said to be nulled, *i. e.* made void or none, either as to its essence and being, or as to its power and operation: yea to be *absolutely nulled* in some operations, though absolutely in force in other. Null as to such ends or persons, though in its perfect validity to other. But when Mr. *Baxter* saith absolutely null, he would be taken in another sense then he dares to avouch in the sense that the words do most litterally and gramatically import, viz.

viz. the whole and abſolute nulling of it not onely to ſome, but to all operations, ends, and perſons: yea not onely to its operation but to its being alſo. For ſo much that diſtinguiſhing word (abſolutely) inſinuateth, *viz.* in contra-diſtinction to *ſecundum quid.* that it is nulled, not as to this or that purpoſe, in this or another reſpect, but abſolutely, ſimply, wholly, from having any more operation or being. And this equivocation of his ſerves him to three ends.

1 To leave a ſecret accuſation and odium among the people upon the Orthodox Divines againſt whom his diſpute bendeth, that they deny both the power and being of the Law of God, and hold that it is become uſeleſs and abrogated, ſo that the people of God muſt be no more acquainted with it. And this is a tacit ſlander, for who among them ever taught ſuch things?

2 To lay open to himſelf a wide field for a luxuriating and extravagant diſputation, to affirm or deny, confirm or confute any thing about the preſent ſtate of the Law, knowing that what is incompetent to what he aſſerteth in one ſenſe, will be enough competent in another, and he doubts not while he is thus circling and roving, ſome pur-blind ones will be taken in his ſnare, if none els yet at leaſt ſuch as are made to be taken, 2 *Pet.* 2. 12.

3 That if his words come to a ſtrict examination, how little of ſimplicity and truth, how much of doublenes and falſhood is couched in them, he may not want a place of retreat: his meaning forſooth was but ſo and ſo, and there is a fault in them that miſtake him.

2 The ſame might I ſay of the word *repeal* which he uſeth. But becauſe he repeats it again in the Explication of this Aphoriſm, affirming that there are godly and learned men that hold the repealing of the firſt Covenant, &c. I ſhall there ſpeak what els might be here not unfitly ſpoken.

3 No leſs ambiguous is it what he will have us to underſtand by the Old Covenant, which he affirms not to be nulled, but to have the New Covenant ſuper-added to it: at leaſt to what ſenſe thereof he will ſtand. Whether he meaneth,

1 The Law of nature not ſounded in the ear but written in the heart of man at his Creation, *Doe and live, Sin and dye?* Or

2 That Covenant expreſſed in the word, about a poſitive Command of not eating of the Tree of knowledge of good and evill. *Eat and dye*, and conſequently *Abſtein and live?* Or

3 The Covenant of the Law written in ſtones upon *Mount Sinai?* If the firſt, Mr. *Baxter* himſelf ſometimes declares his doubting, whether there were ſuch a Law, with a clear impreſſion of its penalty, ever created and imprinted in mans ſoul? And there are not wanting ſome among the moſt profound and Claſſicall Divines, which hold that whatſoever notions of naturall righteouſnes and holines, of God, of good and evill, of truth and falſhood, there are in naturall men without the word; the ſame not to be ingraven into them by nature, or remainders of any Law written in mans heart at his firſt Creation: but of Gods immediate infuſion by a generall and common operation of the Spirit in time, diſtributed to ſome in a greater to ſome in a leſſer meaſure, to ſome ſcarce at all, as his infinite wiſedom ſhall ſee it to make moſt for his glory. And from theſe Mr. *Baxter* ſeems elſwhere not to diſſent. And how then can that be nulled and repealed, or what new ſuper-addition can there be made to that whith was never in being? much leſs can a Covenant ſtand firm, which was never exiſtent.

If the ſecond, then contrary to his Aſſertion, the Old Covenant in reſpect of our perſonall Obligation to it, and of the dependence of our life and death upon it according to our perſonall obedience or diſobedience to it, is nulled; there being now no acceſſible Paradiſe, nor tree of knowledg of good and evill, about which our obedience may be exerciſed, or diſobedience manifeſted.

If the third, Mr. *Baxter* ſpeaketh point-blank in contrariety to the Apoſtle, in ſaying that the Covenant of Grace was added to the Law or Covenant of works. For the Apoſtle giveth the priority to the Promiſe or Covenant of Grace, and affirmeth expreſly that the Law or Covenant of works was many hundred years after, added to it: *Gal.* 3. 17, 19. So that we know not where to meet with Mr. *Baxter* to underſtand, much leſs to anſwer him.

4 He hath a mentall reſervation alſo, when he affirmeth that the *Covenant of Grace was ſuper-added as the onely poſſible way of life.* Who knows whether he pronounceth it the onely poſſible way to life, as it hath ſulture and ſupportance from the Law and Covenant of Works to which it is ſuper-added, and ſo *Moſes* and Chriſt meeting together in the Mount do ſave a poor ſinner, and what the Law could not do of it ſelf, being weak through the fleſh, [that could not fulfill it] *Rom.* 8. 3. Now by the ſuper-added help of Grace, it doth perform? Or as it is operative in it ſelf and by it ſelf, ſaving

wing by its own ſoveraign power without any help from the works of the Law. Why doth not Mr. *Baxter* ſpeak out? *Veritas non quærit angulos.* Truth loveth to ſhew its face in the cleer light, not hiding it ſelf in the clouds. I do no wrong to M^r. *Baxter* in preſſing upon him for his meaning herein; every man may ſee in the ſequell of his Tractate, that grace and faith have with him, very little power to juſtifie or ſave, but what they borrow and fetch home in a Cardinals Hat or Monks Cowl from good works.

5 And he leaves us in the dark and doubtfull, what he means by the word *hereby*, when he ſaith Chriſt doth not null the Covenant *hereby*, it is a relative word and muſt have its meaning from that which is antecedent in the tenth Aphoriſm, *viz.* Chriſts preſcribing of a new Law, and *tendering of a new Covenant.* The old Covenant is not nulled *hereby* ſaith Mr. *Baxter.* Doth he mean by the tendering of the New Covenant? Or the offer of Grace? This makes nothing to the end he drives at. None conceiving that the offer or tendering of Grace to a ſinner, doth forthwith free him from the Curſe of the Law, untill he accepts the tender. Or doth he mean that the effectualizing of the Covenant of Grace to a ſinner, or the taking of him effectually into the Covenant of Grace, doth not make void the Law to him as a Covenant of works? This is indeed like himſelf, and agreeable to his purpoſe. He is not conſiſtent with himſelf nor with the moſt ſubtle and ſophiſticall of the Papiſts whom he loves as dearly as himſelf, if he do not ſo mean. Nevertheles becauſe he is willing here to paſs under a vizzard, I will not trouble my ſelf to unmask him. Himſelf will openly enough diſcover himſelf to us, when the humour takes him. At preſent let him be ſullen.

6 The ſame might I ſay of that which followeth. The former, *i. e. The Covenant of works or the Law, ſtill continueth to command, prohibite, promiſe, and threaten.* A wide dominion and large authority, but who the ſubjects & ſervants are over whom it is exerciſed, he leaves (as all the reſt) in an ambiguity, is not diſpoſed to tell us, except the next words do it. So that the ſins even of the juſtified, are ſtill breaches of that Law, and *&c.*

7 But here alſo he determineth to paſſe away in the dark, tells us onely what power the Law hath againſt the ſins, not againſt the perſons of the juſtified, that it threatens and curſeth their tranſgreſſions, but whether onely upon the perſon of Chriſt ſatisfying

for them; or els in their own perſons alſo, after Chriſt hath ſatisfied, is a ſecret that at this time and in this place, we muſt not know from him; though if he had not let it out before, he would have been in pangs of travell with it untill he were delivered of it.

Thus have we found M. *Baxter* in this Aphoriſm fighting againſt the fore-mentioned Concluſion and the Scriptures that confirme it, with his ſword in the ſcabbard. How terrible the skirmiſh was they that felt either the point or edge of his weapon can tell you. Suppoſe he ſhould now unſheath it, who could ſtand before his drawn ſword? This he is about to do, by his

Explication.

Mr. B. *I acknowledge that this aſſertion is diſputable and difficult, and many places of Scripture are uſually produced which ſeem to contradict it. I know alſo that it is the judgement of learned and godly men, that the Law as it is a Covenant of works, is quite null and repealed in regard of the ſins of believers. Yea many do believe that the Covenant of works is repealed to all the the world, and onely the Covenant of grace in force.*

Againſt both theſe I maintain this aſſertion, by the Arguments which you find under the following Poſition 13. *And I hope notwithſtanding that I extoll free grace as much, and preach the Law as little, in a forbidden ſenſe; as though I held the contrary opinion.*

Firſt he acknowledgeth his Aſſertion to be diſputable and difficult. We have found it not onely to be ſo, but to be ſo of his own making, by means of his clothing it with the darknes of ſuch and ſo many ambiguities, equivocations, &c. Againſt it he ſaith there is a two-fold authority uſually produced, the one Divine, the other humane. The one he deſpiſeth and blowes of as contemptible, the other he falſifieth (I am confident) that he may have ſomewhat to ſay in anſwer to it.

1 There is Divine authority or many Scriptures produced, which ſeem to contradict his Aſſertion. And here take we notice in how baſe eſteem he hath the Holy Scriptures; of thoſe many Scriptures he vouchſafeth not to anſwer one, no nor to cite one: why? but that he thinks, when the Scriptures, and his own aſſertions do contradict either the other, the authority of his own judgment not only to parallel but alſo to over-weigh the authority of the Scriptures. What Papiſt, what Enthuſiaſt hath or can have the Scriptures in leſs eſteem then this Aphoriſt ſhews himſelf here

here and elſwhere to have? What Scriptures are brought againſt him, he diſdaineth them an anſwer, yea a glance of his eye to ſee them, or tongue to read them to us. But if he finds any Scripture whoſe point with much bowing and wreſting he thinks he may turn about againſt us that have no more wit but to think their authority venerable and requiring our ſubmiſſion thereunto: of theſe he makes uſe, to befool yet more ſuch fools as regard them. If I fail in my cenſure, the Lord forgive to me the miſtake of my judgment, and to Mr. *Baxter* his giving occaſion, yea cauſe of ſuch a miſtaking.

And as the authority of Scriptures is pufft from him with leſs then a piff or piſh, ſo do we find humane authority (in all probability) falſified by him. I know (ſaith he) that learned and godly men are of this judgment that the Law as a Covenant of works is quite null and repealed in regard of the ſins of beleevers. I do not doubt but by theſe learned and godly he means ſome Proteſtant Divines, whom ſomtimes he will flatter, ſmooth, and almoſt ſpit in their mouths, to allure them to run after him. Now if he do not falſify their aſſertions, let him name but one of them that ever affirmed the Law to be ſo repealed. I may poſſibly acknowledg him to be, in the main, learned and godly, but I believe I ſhall never account him to have been conſiderate in laying down ſuch an aſſertion. For it directly contradicts the doctrine of our Saviour, *Think not* (ſaith he) *that I am come to deſtroy the Law*, &c. *I am not come to deſtroy but fulfill. Verily, verily, Heaven and Earth ſhall paſs, but not one jot or tittle ſhall not paſs from the Law till all be fulfilled*, Mat. 5. 17, 18. Or to whom ſhould it be repealed? not to unbeleevers; for it is conſented in both ſides that they are under the Law, under the Curſe. Nor to beleevers, for the Law hath purſued their ſins unto death in the body of Chriſt, and by Mr. *Baxters* acknowledgment hath inflicted upon him for them, upon them in him, the *tantundem* if not the *idem* which it ever threatned againſt ſinners. And how is the Law repealed in any of its power, that doth or hath executed all its power upon all that have been tranſgreſſors? Mr. *B.* very well knoweth what doctrine is taught in the Reformed Churches, but will needs falſify it, as he doth alſo the Holy Scriptures.

We affirm that the Law is ſtill in force and ſhall be til the worlds end. We preach not a repeal of any of its power or righteouſneſs which it had from God at any time. Neither on the other ſide, do

we

we attribute to it a power or unrighteouſnes which God never gave it. We grant it a power to take full vengeance upon every ſinner for every ſin committed during life. But we deny that if any be raiſed to a ſecond life after death (as was Chriſt) having born the whole wrath due to the ſins of the former life, that ſuch a one comes under the power of the Law again; the Law hath never more dominion over him. But ſo ſtands the caſe with believers: They have ſuffered in Chriſt, done their Law in Chriſt, are dead in Chriſt, and in him they have ſatisfied the Juſtice of the Law for the ſins of their whole life. If now they are alſo riſen with Chriſt, and are dignified with a new life, the life of grace, ſo that though they live, it is not ſo much they that live, as that Chriſt liveth in them, and the life which they live in the fleſh is by the faith of the Son of God, *Gal.* 2. 20. In this new life which they have by their union unto Chriſt, now triumphant, the Law can no more reach them, then Chriſt himſelf triumphant. So the Law is nulled to them, but never repealed, nulled becauſe it hath inflicted upon them its whole penalty, and after it hath ſo done, it hath no more power over the very reprobates, much leſſe over the Saints. So that the Law being null or of no force to believers, hath received no diminution to its power, holding it ſtill firm and entire as ever; no more then the Law of the Land is weakened for that when it hath inflicted death upon the Felon or Traytor, it hath no further power to queſtion him. As, before they had exiſtence in *Adam*, their not exiſting yet in him, and under the Law by being in *Adam*, argued no weaknes in the Law: So when they have done their Law for the ſins committed while under the Law, and that by their new union unto and exiſtence in Chriſt, they ceaſe to be under the Law, that the Law hath no power over them, argues no wound or weakneſſe or detriment that the Law hath ſuſtained; any more then it doth, becauſe it is null in power to the Angels in Heaven, over whom it had never power: or null unto Chriſt now in Heaven, over whom it had once power.

Mr. *Baxter* acknowledgeth that the penalty of the LAW is due to none but the tranſgreſſors of the Law, to the unrighteous, and withall affirms *Theſ.* 16. p. 96. and *Explication* page 98, 99. That Satisfaction for diſobedience is our Righteouſnes, makes a man ſo perfectly righteous (as to the Law and further penalty thereof) as if he had never diſobeyed. Yet we find him here fighting not onely againſt Heaven and Earth, but againſt him-

himself also, to deny the nullity of the Law to them that have satisfied by CHRIST, for their disobedience to the Law; making it one and the same thing with the repealing of the Law. This word repealing being here foisted in by himself, partly to make way for his sophisticall, and bombasticall distinctions which are no less deer to him then his life, therefore in the Explication of the next Thesis, comes in great ostentation, no less trappled with them, then a Cart-horse with his painted Collar, bells and feathers, partly to give occasion of his riding in state upon *Grotius* his shoulders, to shew what new, subtle, and fine-spun learning, he hath drawn from so noble and Apostaticall a Doctor, no less fit to the Argument he hath in hand, than the shoo is for the hand, or the glove for the foot.

But lastly and principally, that having according to his wonted and inbred subtlety, put on a false vizzard upon the doctrine of the reformed Churches, he might in the 13 *Thes.* and its explication, dispute victoriously against the vizzard, having nothing to say against the doctrine in its own nature and verity.

As for the other pretended opinion, that the Covenant of works is repealed to all the world, and the Covenant of Grace alone in force: Those that hold it (most probably) are some Eutopians that Mr. *Baxter* alone, and no other either man or Angel besides him have had acquaintance with, or the happines to know their opinion. So that Mr. *Baxter* might have done well to have taken a second voyage into the land of Eutopia, either to have joyned with them or disputed against them upon their own happy turf, and not to have troubled our unhappy Coasts with this Controversie: it hath the unhappines doubtles to be pestered with so many opinionists as any Nation in the world, but among all hath not such bugbears or phrenticks, that I know, who maintein such an assertion. But it is one of Mr. *Baxters* subtleties to feign such ghosts and phantasmes of men to fight against, thereby taking the advantage secretly and unespyed (as he hopeth) to erect more cursed and monstrous assertions, than all such ghosts and phantasmes as he feigneth, could have devised. But we cannot stop him in his Career, on he posteth, and *Against both these* [imaginary opinions] saith he, *I maintein this Assertion*, i. e. his 11th *Thesis*, which we have found to be a meer fardle of equivocations, ambiguities, &c. for explication whereof we have sought where he promised it, but have found nothing but fictions, imaginations, and new falshoods more to obscure it.

Yet

Yet this peece of darknes he promiſeth to maintain under the 13 poſition, where we ſhall wait on him. But in the mean while he hath a 12th *Theſ.* and an explication to interſert which we muſt by the way take notice of as a moſt noble preparative to the ſublime learning which in the 13th he will deliver. As for that brag wherewith he ſhuts up all that he hath ſaid in the titular explication of this his 11th poſition, [I hope that I extoll free Grace as much, and preach the Law as little in a forbidden ſenſe, as though I held the contrary opinion.] unto it I ſay but this: If his preaching be ſo much better and honeſter than his writing, we could wiſh him henceforth to apply himſelf wholly to the Pulpit not at all to the Preſſe. And notwithſtanding his brags, and all his equivocations, windings, and fallacious argumentation, we will ſtill keep in minde the ſtate of the queſtion from which he ſeeks to avert us, *viz.* that the Law is not nulld to beleevers, but even when they are beleevers, they are ſtill under the Law as a Covenant of works. This he hath promiſed to maintain, againſt Scriptures and Orthodox Writers, whatſoever els he ſpeaketh and not home to this point is beſides the queſtion. Attend we therefore what he hath to make this good in the next poſition.

Chap. IX.

Mr. Baxters *Diſtinctionary preparative to the Confirmation of his Aſſertion* [*that beleevers are under the Law as a Covenant of works*] *examined: and all that he haeh therein manifeſted to be in part impertinent to the queſtion, and pertinent onely to his vain-glory: in the reſt to be Popiſh and deſtructive to all hope of ſalvation.*

Theſis 12.

Bax. *Therefore we muſt not plead the repeal of the Law for our Juſtification; but muſt refer it to our ſurety, who by the value and efficacy of his once offering and merits doth continually ſatisfie.*

We aſſent here to his words in ſubſtance, but finde Cauſe in the placing of them, to doubt of a fallacious meaning which he hath therein. 1 We do not we will not plead the repeal of the Law for

or our Justification. But Mr. *Baxter* (as he makes it appear by what s antecedent and following in this dispute) would have us to conceive, that in the not repealing of the Law is included our being under the Law as a Covenant of works. Such tame fools, in the lofty opinion that he hath of himself, doth he account us. If in the following words of the position, he meant fairly he would speak plainly. We must not plead the repeal of the Law for Justification, &c. What then? but we must refer it to our surety who by the value, &c. Why saith he not plainly we must not plead the lawes reveal for &c. but our fullfilling of it in Christ, or the satisfaction which he hath once made for all the breaches of the Law which we have or shall have committed? why speaks he ambiguously? we must refer it to our surety, what? whether or when we shall be justified? or to him to plead for us neglecting to seek for any ablenes to plead and give account of our hope for our selves, willingly remaining uncertain of salvation all our life time? And when he saith by his once offering and merits, he doth continually satisfie: though in a good sense it be true and good, yet hath he not already actually satisfied? and are not beleevers by that satisfaction actually justified? we shall finde anon there was a monster conteined in the womb of these equivocall locutions. In the interim let us search whether in the place of explication there be any thing spoken to explain his meaning.

Explication.

Bax. *I shall here explain to you, in what sense and how far the Law is in force, and how far not: and then prove it in and under the next head.*

Here now he brings in a quaternion of distinctions to undermine and blow up the authority of the sacred Trinity, expressed in the precited Scriptures that proves beleevers not to be under the Law as a Covenant of works: and foure against three is odds.

Bax. *You must here distinguish betwixt*

1 *The repealing of the Law and the relaxing of it*; 2 *between a dispensation absolute and respective*; 3 *Between the alteration of the Law, and the alteration of the subjects relation to it*. 4 *Between a discharge conditionall, with a suspension of execution, and a discharge absolute.*

Parturiunt Montes. What follows upon all these polite and profound distinctions? many notable Conclusions doubtles: Mr. *Baxters*

ters nose is as right in the middle of his face, since as before his disburthening himself of these distinctions. But most certainly we are dull and cannot piece deeply. But Mr. *Baxter* is no less acute than deep, let us see what work he can make of it.

Bax. *And so I resolve the question thus.*

1 *The law of works is not abrogate or repealed, but dispensed with, or relaxed. A dispensation is (as* Grotius *defineth it) an act of a superiour whereby the obligation of a law in force is taken away, as to certain persons and things.*

2 *This dispensation therefore is not totall or absolute, but respective. For* 1 *Though it dispense with the rigorous execution, yet not with every degree of execution.* 2 *Though the law be dispensed with as it conteineth the proper subjects of the penalty, viz. the parties offending, and also the circumstances of duration, &c. yet in regard of the meer punishment, abstracted from persons and circumstances, it is not dispensed with. For to Christ it was not dispensed with. His satisfaction was by paying the full value.*

3 *Though by this dispensation our freedom may be as full as upon a repeal, yet the alteration is not made in the Law, but in our estate and relation to the Law.*

4 *So farr is the Law dispensed with to all, as to suspend the rigorous execution for a time, and a liberation or discharge conditionall procured and granted them. But an absolute discharge is granted to none in this life. For even when we do perform the condition, yet still the discharge remains conditionall, till we have quite finished our performance. For it is not one instantaneous act of beleeving, which shall quite discharge us, but a continued faith. No longer are we discharged than we are beleevers. And when the condition is not performed, the law is still in force, and shall be executed upon the offender himself.*

I speak nothing in all this of the directive use of the morall Law to beleevers, but how farr the Law is yet in force even as it is a Covenant of works; because an utter repeal of it in this sense is so commonly, but inconsiderately asserted. That it is no further overthrown, no not to beleevers, then is here explained. I now come to prove.

Here we see the off-spring of the precedent mountainous and swelling distinctions. *Exit ridiculus mus.* In the three first Conclu-

sions

sions a meer tattle about the repealing and abrogating, or dispensing and relaxing of the Law; and of its dispensation in a totality and absolutenes, or in a respectivenes to persons, circumstances and degrees of execution, &c. which is as proper to the thing that he drives at, as swines flesh and a peacock strangled, with all his glittering feathers, to the satisfying of a Jewes hungry appetite. Surely either Mr. *Br.* had forgotten, or thought we had forgotten that he had before vented this Mysticall learning of his own and *Grotius* his brain; or doubted that it was not finely enough set out there, therefore that he might have the full praise of so curious and spider-threeded a speculation, brings it in here again, in somewhat a new and more specious a dress. Let him rest contented, we acknowledge it all very trim. If he beleeve us not, let him set it as a philactery upon his garment. It will tend so much to the strengthening of it, as of the cause he hath in hand. For the question is not whether the Law be repealed or but dispensed with, But whether it be in force to beleevers as a Covenant of works, with which the three first positions meddle not. The word [abrogating] some orthodox Divines (I confess) do use, but not in a sense equipollent with the word [repeal,] meaning thereby onely a nullity of the lawes domination over beleevers. The alteration not being in the Law (as we acknowledge with Mr. *Br.*) but in our estate and relation to it. The law reigneth over all that are under it. But the Saints are not under the Law, saith the Apostle, But as (*Calvin* saith) in Christ above it. *Inst. lib. 3. cap. 19. sect. 2.*

But his fullnes and plainnes in his fourth Conclusion maketh some recompence for all his Amphibologies, all his dark & doubtfull locutions in that which went before. Here we acknowledge his ingenuity, He so speaks as that an Englishman may understand him. Here he tells us what he meant before of nulling, repealing, &c. of the Law to beleevers, that it is not so nulled, abrogated, repealed, relaxed or dispensed with, but that all their life time they are still under the Law as a Covenant of works. And why could not this be spoken, without so great a preparative of sophisticall equivocations and distinctions? It pleased him surely to act the Alderman that deckt himself with all his robes and rich furniture, to go into his stable and cutt off his horses tayl. But it shall satisfie us that after some suspension, he at last discovers to us his meaning. Let us examine it, and first we shall finde set forth in two positions; two soul-ravishing priviledges, purchased by the Lord Christ for

the Elect Saints, that whoſoever of them will reſt ſatisfied wi
them, may gird himſelf faſt, and depart without them. 1 That th
have ſo large a diſcharge from the rigor of the Law for a whil
as any of the worſt reprobates. 2 That they have no more diſcha
from the Lawes curſe than the worſt of reprobates. Muſt w
not account him a Saint that hath a faſtidious ſtomack or ſo
mouth that cannot reliſh theſe dainties. The former Concluſio
he reacheth to us in theſe words. *So farr is the Law diſpenſed with*
all, as to ſuſpend the rigorous execution of it for a time, and a liberation a
diſcharge conditionall, procured and granted them. Jam ſumus ergo pare
In this the ſons of God are in as good a caſe as the reprobates, a
ſomwhat before the Devills. The latter Concluſion in theſe word
But an abſolute diſcharge is granted to no man in this life. Jam ſumus er
pares. Yet have we as large cauſe of exulting and joy in the Ho
Ghoſt as the reprobates, that (as farr as we can diſcern) we are n
neerer to hell than the children of hell, whoſe inheritance is in he
for ever.

To prove the latter aſſertion, that none are, that beleevers a
not abſolutely diſcharged from the law as a Covenant of work
in this life, he borroweth matter from Pelagians, Papiſts, Socini
ans, Arminians, and the whole rabble of profeſſed enemies to th
grace of God in Chriſt, manifeſteth (*Scotus* like) *ignotum per ignot*
us. carries us into a dungeon of darknes, to diſcern Colors whic
we could not judge of in the light, to his minde; brings ſeven othe
Devills, many other hereſies worſe than the firſt, at leaſt ſo bad as th
firſt, to ſtrengthen the firſt. *Clavum clavo* [not] *extorquet*, [but] *in*
quet & figit, beats in other wedges not to looſe the firſt, but to fa
ſten all. Having gotten in the paw of the beaſt, beats and beetles i
many of his hornes after to wedge faſt all.

The Popiſh errors which he brings as an addition to confir
that beleevers are during life, under the law, are theſe. 1 That the
which are in Chriſt have not their ſinns fully pardoned, neither ar
themſelves wholly juſtified in this world. 2ly, That whoſoev
ſhall be juſtified in the world to come, muſt procure it by his ow
willing, running & perſevering in this world. 3 That they whic
are in Chriſt may fall away and be damned. 4 That no man whil
he lives can be certain of his ſalvation. 5 To this he addeth on
worſe than any Popiſh or Socinian hereſie as proper to himſelf an
from himſelf alone, *viz.* That all beleevers (notwithſtanding Chri
ſatisfaction for them, notwithſtanding their perſevering faith i
hi

him, yet) muſt be at laſt damned for ever. Some of theſe errors are in expreſs words aſſerted, the reſt by neceſſary Conſequence implyed in this ſhort diſpute of Mr. *B:* The firſt he expreſly affirmeth. Even when we do perform the condition, yet ſtill the diſcharge remains conditionall (ſaith he) till we have quite finiſhed the performance, *i. e.* till we have gaſped out the laſt breath. So that in this life there is no diſcharge, but a conditionall promiſe that poſſibly we may in the world to come be diſcharged. what is this diſcharging but Juſtifying and abſolving us? from what but from the ſinn which we have committed, and from the vengeance which the law threateneth? ſuch a juſtification he denyeth to be attainable in this life. And this argument he thus urgeth; Whoſoever is not perfectly juſtified, is ſtill under the law as a Covenant of works. But the very Saints are not in this world ſo Juſtified. *ergo* they are under the Law, &c. The ſecond, that Juſtification in the world to come muſt be procured by mans own willing, &c. He delivereth plainly enough in that he ſaith, that we muſt perform, yea continue performing the conditions untill we go out of this world, and then we may poſſibly obtein to be juſtified in the world to come. What are the conditions by which we procure the diſcharge? Mr. *B:* tells us afterward (as we ſhall finde) Faith and good works. Theſe muſt we obſerve and continue obſerving to the end to procure juſtification after this life ended. And ſo it is by our own ſtrong and laſting endeavours, that after the world is ended our ſins may be poſſibly forgiven, and we ſaved. Here if we grant unto him, that we are Gods hirelings thus to work in his vineyard the whole day, the whole term of our life; and that Juſtification is the wages of our work to be paid in the evening, *i. e.* at the end of the world, then it will follow indeed (what he deduceth hence) that untill the world be ended we are ſtill under the Curſe of the Law. 3 That they that are in Chriſt may fall away and be damned if they continue in their Apoſtacy, or may after their many apoſtacies, oft renew again their union with Chriſt, and ſo at laſt be juſtified, he ſpeaks out fully in telling us. *It is not one inſtantaneous act of beleeving, but a continued faith that ſhall quite diſcharge us; that no longer are we diſcharged than we are beleevers, and when we ceaſe to beleeve, the Law is ſtill in force, and condemneth.* Either he reaſoneth from an unpoſſible ſuppoſition, or a poſſible and uſuall Caſe incident to beleevers. If from an impoſſibility, it makes not at all for his purpoſe. If it were poſſible for him to fall from grace, then ſhould beleevers be under the Law again. But it is not poſſi-

Here he followeth Arminius *becauſe in this point* Arminius *overruns the Papiſts.*

possible, &c. *ergo* they shall never be reduced under the law again. But he argueth as from a possible and usuall case, and then if we grant him, that the Saints may fall away, it will follow that they are not absolutely freed from the curse of the law in this life. But in granting this, we grant our selves to be Popish, and may shake hands with Mr. *Br.* The fourth, that no man can in this life be certain of salvation, depends on the former. For if we cannot be certain of our perseverance, we cannot be certain of eternall happines: and by necessary consequence it must be concluded also that we are not discharged from the bondage of the Law. But we cannot grant the premisse from which such inferences are drawn, unless we will grant away our selves also in despair to perdition. And therefore we deny to Mr. *B:* all his argumentation here, as having nothing of Christ, but all of Antichrist in it.

I mean not to prosecute in this place a dispute against Mr. *B:* about these four pernicious errors which he holds in common with other Papists; himself will elswhere minister to me an occasion of speaking more fully to them, where he doth not onely touch upon, but also professedly handle the most (if not all) of them. Here I shall onely (to preserve the simple from his guile) manifest upon what fallacious grounds he pitcheth these his assertions. They are principally these two.

1 That Faith as an infused gift of grace, and a part of our inherent righteousnesse doth justifie, when it is not onely (as the Papists say) *Fides informis*, but also *Formata*, perfected both in its duration of time, and in all its Concomitants the other habits, vertues, and gifts of grace, such as are love, mercy, goodnes, temperance, &c. and in the fruits and acts of all these which are good works. For so shall we finde him in the sequele of this tractate teaching.

2 That Faith and all those its Concomitants with their fruits and effects depend upon our freewill, to gain and retein, refuse and lose them at the pleasure and lust of our corrupt freewill. These points being granted all those foure errors will follow as necessary deductions thence. But the orthodox Churches hold and the Oracles of the Gospel teach otherwise. 1 That our Justification floweth from our union to Christ, that All in *Adam* are under the Law, under the Curse, unblessed, unjustified, unpardoned. But that all which are in Christ are justified, pardoned, &c. So the Apostle, *Phil.* 3. 8. &c. *All things are doung to me that I may winn Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousnes, which is of the law,*

but

but that which is through the Faith of Christ, &c. Here was the Apostles righteousnes and Justification to winn Christ and be found in him. And this union unto Christ is made up principally by the Spirit, by which Christ apprehendeth and uniteth us to himself. No otherwise is our Justification attributed to faith than as it is the instrument by which we apprehend Christ to our selves as we are apprehended of Christ to himself, and bring home into our bosom the benefit of this our union to him, together with the sense and joy of our Justification by him. This I shall have occasion to illustrate and prove more fully before I part with Mr. *Baxter*, and because he will call me to it in another place, here I shall say no more of it. 2 That our Faith both in its existence and perseverance, dependeth not upon the fickle tweek of our own freewill, but upon the support of Gods power and unchangeable love, and upon the vertue of Christs mediation and faithfullnes of the Mediator; though our freewill be mutable, yet the gifts & calling of God are without repentance, *i. e.* without Change. *Rom.* 11. 29. *He that hath begun a good work in you, will performe it till the day of Jesus Christ*, Phil. 1. 6. Though our faith be weak, yet we are preserved by the power of God through Faith and salvation. Christ hath by his sacrifice purchased to us, not onely salvation but faith also, both in its being and persevering to apprehend him and it to our persevering Consolation; *They shall never perish* (saith he) *neither shall any man*, viz any one, man or Devill, *pluck them out of my hands*, Joh. 10. 28. *It is the will of my Father which sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day*, Joh. 6. 39.

If now the word of God stand, and the judgement of the Churches that is grounded upon the immutable word of the eternall God; then those bug-bear assertions, the (brats of Mr. *Baxters* windy distinctions) which he brings as arguments to prove the slavish bondage of beleevers under the Law, will appear vaporous and so vanish. For if our Justification proceed not from the old age or perfection of faith & its Concomitants, but from our union to Christ, and no otherwise from faith than as it instrumentally closeth us with Christ (which no instantaneous Faith, that lives and dyes at an instant, but a truly living faith can do) then it will appear to be a falshood, that None is justified in this life. Nay all that by a living faith are united to Christ, are fully justified in this life. And as many as are unjustified here, shall not be either justified or saved hereafter.

Again,

Again, if our Justification spring from our union with Christ, then not at all from our own willing, running, and persevering. And so his two first Arguments fall into shivers.

3 If no true and justifying faith be instantaneous, and the perseverance of faith in the beleever, and of a beleever in the faith, depend not upon mans mutable will, but upon the all-sufficiency of Christs merits, and the truth and omnipotency of the most high God: then his two latter assertions, *viz.* that of Apostacy from Christ, and the other of the uncertainty of salvation, fall into shivers also. For what more fixed and certain than what by the will of God, is bottomed and susteined with the rock Christ, and the truth and power of the eternall God? None then of his popish arguments here brought, do give the least future to his assertion, that *The very beleevers are under the Law as a Covenant of Works.*

The fift Position, that all Believers (according to Mr. *Baxters* doctrine) must needs be damned, ariseth from the Assertion which by the four mentioned Propositions, as by so many Arguments, he goeth about to prove: *viz.* That untill death they are under the Law as a Covenant of works. If so then must they be needs damned:

1 Because whosoever is under that Covenant is bound to seek
Gal. 5. 3. freedome from vengeance, and possession of blessednes, by the conditions of the same Covenant. But these conditions are unpossible to man in his present feeblenes and corruption, *viz.* the purification of himself from all sin, and perfect performance of all obedience. Who can perform all this, except peradventure St. *Francis* and Mr. *Baxter*. so that either none or at least they alone can be saved.

2 Because whosoever professing the Faith, is in the least part
Gal. 5. 4. under the Law, *&c.* is fallen from Christ, hath no part in the Covenant of Grace, as I have before proved, therefore must necessarily be damned.

3 Because whosoever liveth and dyeth under a Covenant of works, is under the curse and damnation, *Gal.* 3. 10.

That which follows in the conclusion of the Explication of this Thesis, acquits me from all mens suspition of doing Mr. *B.* any wrong in mis-interpreting his meaning in this his dispute. Himself acknowledgeth it to be his own sense. In all this (saith he) *i. e.* in this whole dispute, I speak nothing of the directive use of the Law, [*viz.* as it is a rule and Counseller to a Christian in all morall righte-

righteousnes] but how far the Law is yet in force as a Covenant of works, because an utter repeal of it in this sense is so commonly but inconsiderately asserted. [Let him name but one considerable man that ever affirmed the Law repealed, that it may appear it is not a slander which he casts upon the Anti-Papists.] But he proceeds, That it is no further overthrown, no not to believers, then is here explained, I now come to prove.

And we shall come after him to see what he proveth, and how far he proveth. And that it may appear to all what sincerity is in the man, two things are to be kept diligently in mind.

1 What he is to prove.

2 What he is not to meddle with in proving, if he will shew himself honest, and not a meer Impostor.

We utterly deny any repeal or abrogating of the Law as a Covenant of works to them that are under the Law, or have not don their Law, yea any repeal of the Law at all, as I have made to appear. Therefore if Mr. B. go about to prove either that the Law is not repealed, or that unbeleevers or such as have not done their Law by satisfying for the breaches thereof, are still under the Law; This is fallacious dealing, a proving of that which never came into Question, for all acknowledg it without his proving. That which he is to prove is that none, no not believers are absolutely discharged from the Law, but are under it as a Covenant of works to the utmost moment of their life. This he promiseth throughout his whole dispute to prove, let us attend how he doth it in this 13 Position, under which he promiseth to do it.

Chap. X.

Mr. Baxter's *much promised and long expected Arguments to prove Believers to be under the Law as a Covenant of works, discovered to be meer impertinencies, and Sophistical Impostures: And the Question whether the Elect while yet Unbelievers, are so under the Law, and in what respects, discussed.*

Thesis 13.

B. *IF this were not so, but that Christ had abrogated the first Covenant, then it would follow,*

1 *That no ſin but that of* Adam, *or finall unbelief is ſo much as threatned with death, or that death is explicitely* (i. e. by any Law) *due to it or deſerved by it. For what the Law in force doth not threaten, that is not explicitely deſerved or due by the Law.*

2 *It would follow that Chriſt dyed not to prevent or remove the wrath and curſe ſo deſerved, or due to us, for any but* Adams *ſin, nor to pardon our ſins at all: but onely to prevent our deſert of wrath and curſe, and conſequently to prevent our need of pardon.*

3 *It would follow that againſt eternall wrath, at the day of judgement, we muſt not plead the pardon of any ſin but the firſt, but our own non deſert of that wrath: becauſe of the repeal of that Law before the ſin was committed. All which conſequences ſeem to me unſufferable, which cannot be avoided if the Law be repealed.*

Unto theſe three Arguments he addeth four more in the Explication of this Poſition, which thus follow.

B. *We may plead our non deſerving of death, for our diſcharge at judgment.*

5 *And further, then Chriſt in ſuffering did not bear the puniſhment due to any ſin but* Adams *firſt, for that which was not threatned to us, was not executed on him. This is a clear but an intolerable conſequence.*

6 *Scripture plainly teacheth that all men* (even the Elect) *are under the Law till they believe, and enter into the Covenant of the Goſpel. Therefore it is ſaid,* Jo. 3. 18. He that believeth not is condemned already, and the wrath of God abideth on him, *ver.* 36 *And we are ſaid to believe for remiſſion of ſins,* Acts 2. 38. Mark 1. 4. Luke 24. 47. Acts 10. 43. & 3. 19. *which ſhew that ſin is not before remitted, and conſequently the Law not repealed but ſuſpended and left in the diſpoſe of the redeemer. Els how could the redeemed be the children of wrath?* Eph. 2. 3. *The circumciſed are debtors to the whole Law,* Gal. 5. 3, 4. *And Chriſt is become of no effect to them: but they that are led by the Spirit are not under the Law, and againſt ſuch there is no Law,* Gal. 5. 18, 23. *The Scripture hath concluded all under ſin* (and ſo far under the Law no doubt) *that the promiſe by faith in Jeſus Chriſt, might be given*

given to them that beleeve, Gal. 3. 22. *We are under the Law when Christ doth redeem us*, Gal. 4. 5. *See also* Ja. 2. 9, 10. 1 Tim. 18. 1 Cor. 15. 56. Gal. 3. 19, 20, 21. *Therefore our deliverance is conditionally from the curse of the Law, viz. if we we will obey the Gospel. And this deliverance, together with the abrogation of the Ceremoniall Law, is it which is so oft mentioned as a privilege of believers, and an effect of the blood of Christ. Which deliverance from the curse is yet more full, when we perform the conditions of our freedom. And then we are said to be dead to the Law*, Rom. 7. 4. *and the obligation to punishment dead, as to us*, ver. 6. *but not the Law void or dead of it self.*

7 *Lastly all the Scriptures and Arguments*, p. 60 61. *which prove that afflictions are punishments, do prove also that the Law is not repealed. For no man can suffer for breaking a repealed Law, nor by the threats of a repealed Law; yet I know that this Covenant of works continueth not to the same ends and uses as before; nor is it so to be preached or used. We must neither take that Covenant as a way to life, as if now we must get our salvation by fulfilling its conditions, nor must we look on its Curse, as lying on us remediless.*

Alas for the conscience of this man! I know (saith he) that this Covenant of works continueth not &c. yet against knowledg and against conscience will he not only teach the contrary, *but with all Jesuiticall arts labour to screw it into the judgments* of men that are more Logicall then Theologicall. How hath he suspended our expectation with promises that in and under the 13 *Thesis* he would bring his Reasons to prove

1 That the Law as a Covenant of works is not become null and void to believers, p. 79. that they are not discharged in this life from the curse of the Law, p. 82. But that

2 They are under the Law as a Covenant of works still, after that they are in Christ and partakers of of his Redemption. Why had he not by and by proved it, but that he might *Bellarmine*-like, first busie his Reader with Sophisticall distinctions and disputes, untill he had forgotten the state of the Question, and then prove what he would, not what he should to his forgetfull Reader. For so there is not the least gry or jota in all his Arguments here that doth so much as glance upon the things that he was to prove, but a labouring to confirm things which no one of those

whom he makes his adverſaries, doth or did ever Queſtion, muc
leſs deny. So that all theſe his Arguments, are meer *impoſtures*, n
(as he tearms them) Reaſons to confirm the Doctrines whi
he pretends to prove.

For firſt, his five firſt Arguments (or rather thoſe three in h
Theſis, which in the Explication he ſub-divides into five) an
the ſeventh alſo in the Explication tends only to prove that G
hath not, did not revoke, repeal and extinguiſh the Law that
ſhould have no more a being, or remain a Law to the ſons of men
aſſoon as *Adam* had ſinned, and a promiſe of redemption by Chri
was made, *Gen.* 3. 15. who ever taught or thought ſo? or what
this to prove that the Saints (after they have ſuffered and ſatis
fied in and by Chriſt the whole penalty of the Law, for all the
tranſgreſſions of the Law) are not delivered from it as a Cov
nant of works?

Secondly, the other Argument which he puts in the ſixth pla
goes about to prove that unbelievers are under the Law. And thi
is as potent a reaſon to prove believers to be under the Law; as
I ſhould thus argue, Mr. *Baxter* is a Jeſuite, becauſe *Bellarmine* an
Maldonat were Jeſuites: or that Mr *Baxter* is not the Teacher o
the Church at *Kederminſter*, becauſe *Robin Hood* and little *John* a
not Teachers there.

This might ſuffice as a full Anſwer to his ſeven Arguments an
to manifeſt his ſin and ſhame in uſing them. But I ſhall add ſom
thing by way of Explication to make that which I have ſaid plai
to the weakeſt. Not imitating Mr. *Baxter*, who under a pretenc
of Explication, doth in moſt places totally darken what was be
fore cleer and plain.

Firſt then, I grant to Mr. *Baxter*, that if Chriſt had from th
beginning of ſins entrance into the world, repealed and (in th
proper and full ſenſe of the word) abrogated the Law, thoſe fiv
conſequences, which he mentioneth in his 5 firſt Arguments woul
follow,

1 That no ſin but that of *Adam*, and finall unbelief is ſo much
as threatened with death, the one being forbidden by the La
while it was in force, the other by the Goſpel, that is ſtill unque
ſtionably in force, Nay not any thing elſe in reference to the ol
Covenant but that of *Adam* ſhould be a ſin, becauſe ſin is the tranſ
greſſion of the Law, and where there is no Law, there can be no
tranſgreſſion.

2 That

2 That Chriſt by his ſatisfaction for us, prevented not the wrath deſerved [*viz.* otherwiſe then by *Adams* ſin] but the deſert of wrath.

3 Neither doth he properly pardon any ſuch ſin, for where no Law is, there is no ſin, where no ſin, there is nothing to be pardoned.

4 And then might we plead innocency, or our non deſerving of death (except before excepted) for our diſcharge at judgement.

5 And Chriſt in ſuffering did not bear the puniſhment of any other ſins of mankinde beſides the fore-mentioned. Thus we grant Mr. *B.* five of his Arguments without any detriment to our Cauſe or advantage to his. Believers are as fully freed from the Law as if he had ſlept while he thus diſputed. For all theſe his Arguments lean upon a falſe ſuppoſition. If the Law be ſo repealed and abrogated (as is before ſuppoſed) then and not els will theſe curſed Conſequences take place. But the law is not ſo repealed &c. therefore none of theſe will follow. For we hold that Believers are therefore delivered from the law as a Covenant of works, not becauſe the law was almoſt from the very beginning repealed or abrogated from being any longer a Covenant of works, but becauſe the law as a Covenant of works hath executed upon them in Chriſt all its penalty for all their ſins, and hath therefore now no more power to queſtion them: as hath been more copiouſly declared before.

The ſame I ſay alſo to the ſeventh Argument as it pointeth to the not repealing of the law, whatſoever els is in it, hath been in anſwer to the place cited, ſufficiently ſpoken to.

His ſixth Argument about which he laboureth more then about all the reſt, though (as I ſaid a little before) it makes nothing to his preſent and explicit purpoſe, proving onely unbelievers to be under the law; (for this is nothing to believers) yet it makes way to an implicit or ſecret end which he hath, and determineth to proſecute with much ardency in the following parts of this Treatiſe. There are two ſorts of unbelievers, the one under a temporary, the other under a finall unbelief, the elect and the reprobate. Mr. *Baxter* here driveth with all his force to prove both under the law, becauſe he conceiveth that if he prove the elect before they beleeve in Chriſt, are under the law, and ſo granted to be, it may be proved much the more eaſily and plainly, that they are ſo

alſo

alſo after they become believers. For many of the ſtrongeſt Arguments which are for the one are for the other, and which are against the one are againſt the other alſo: So that it is hard to bring reaſons for the affirming or denying of either, without giving advantage for the like affirming or denying of both.

I purpoſe not here to anticipate but to ſuſpend the diſpute upon this Queſtion untill Mr. *B.* ſhall ſhew his face openly as a Challenger; here he doth but as it were peep behind the Curtain, in compariſon of what he ſaith afterwards with full expreſſions of himſelf. Yet that I may not be forced then to retreat hither again to what he doth here deliver, but anſwer every thing in its own place; I ſhall at preſent examine thoſe Scriptures which he here produceth, whether and how far they prove elect unbelievers to be under the law as a Covenant of works.

And to clear up a way to the better underſtanding of theſe and the like teſtimonies of Scripture, I ſhall prefix two Poſitions viſibly and apparently ſpringing from the pure fountain of Gods word.

Firſt that all which are elected from eternity ſhall in their appointed times come unto Chriſt and perſevere in him by a living Faith. I mean not onely all but onely theſe and none beſides them. *As many as were ordained to eternall life beleeved*, when Chriſt was, and ſo ſtill do or ſhall believe when Chriſt is, or ſhall be preached to them. *If the Goſpel be hid from any* (*viz.* ſo that they believe not in Chriſt manifeſted by the Goſpel to them) *it is to them that periſh, &c.* 2 Cor. 4. 3. *i. e.* to them that are not elect but reprobates. *All that the Father giveth me ſhall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wiſe caſt out*, [or ſuffer to be loſt] *John* 6. 37. To come to Chriſt is to believe truly in him, ſuch ſhall never be loſt, never fall away, or make ſhipwrack of their Faith. But who are they whom God giveth to Chriſt that they may beleeve in him? *Thine they were, and thou gaveſt them me*, ſaith our Saviour. May I will ſay they were in a peculiar manner to be Gods people, at leaſt by election, and therefore given to Chriſt that by faith in him they might be ſaved, *Jo:* 17. 6. *To you it is given to know the myſteries of the Kingdom of God, but unto them that are without all theſe things are done in Parables; that ſeeing they may ſee and not perceive*, &c. *Mark* 4. 11, 12. Why was it given to the one part to know the myſtery life and ſpirit of the Goſpel, to the other onely the outſide and letter thereof? They were within, theſe without the lines of Gods elec-

Act 13. 48

tion.

tion. *They went out from us but they were not of us, for if they had been of us they would without doubt have continued with us, but they went out that they might be made manifeſt that they were not of us,* 1 Joh: 2. 19. Not of us, he means, not of the number of them that are called according to Gods purpoſe of Election, *Rom.* 8. 28. for then they could not have faln away, *All ſhould have wrought for good to them.* So that hence it followeth that every elect unbeliever ſhall come to and continue in the Faith, and whoſoever doth not ſo is manifeſted not to have been elected of God.

2 That juſtification or remiſſion of ſins, may be conſidered in a threefold reſpect. 1 As it is in God, 2 As it is delivered over by God, into the hands of Chriſt our Mediator. 3 As it is by Chriſt brought home unto and given into the boſom and poſſeſſion of any man. As it is in God, I ſhall pretermit to ſpeak much of it any where, but any thing at all, untill Mr *B.* directly and expreſly calls me to it, leaſt the man ſhould be tormented before his time. For he hates the very naming and thought thereof as an Act Immanent in God, *cane pejus & angui*, and is ready Jew-like to rend his cloaths, and fling duſt in the aire, at any mention thereof, as an article that ſtands in enmity to his juſtification by works. 2 Then as it is delivered into the hands of Chriſt, we may ſpeak of it without ſuch terrible offence to his patience, or ſetting him into ſo direfull a commotion; conditionally that we will undertake for Chriſt that he ſhall be ruled by Mr. *B.* to do what he appoints with it, that is, to keep it in his pocket and deliver it to no man, but hold all under the Curſe of the Law untill the day of judgement, we cannot adventure upon ſuch an undertaking, nevertheles ſhall hold forth the truth of God in this caſe. This is, that Chriſt by offering himſelf a Sacrifice for ſin, and preſenting the Sacrifice of himſelf unto God in the moſt Holy place, *i. e.* in heaven at his Mercy-ſeat, hath thereby effectually purchaſed everlaſting redemption, and remiſſion of ſins, and hath received a full abſolution and acquittance from the father for all his elect by name. So that in Chriſt they are juſtified from all ſin, and freed from the Law as a Covenant of works even while they are unbelievers, have this freedom (I mean) in the hand of Chriſt though not in their own apprehenſion and poſſeſſion. Though as to themſelves and their own judgments, and as to the apprehenſion of men, they are under the Law, under wrath, yet in Chriſt they have done their Law, their iniquities paſt preſent and to come are blotted out, their

their peace made, and they reconciled to God. This is obſervably ſet forth in *Aaron* [and the other High Prieſts his ſucceſſors, as they were Types of Chriſt] *Aaron* the High Prieſt muſt bear the Names of the Children of *Iſrael* engraven upon 2 precious ſtones on the two ſhoulders of his Ephod, before the Lord for a memoriall, *Exod.*28. 10, 12. yea he muſt bear their names in the breaſt-plate of judgment upon his Heart, when he goeth in unto the Holy place, [*viz.* with the blood of the ſacrifice for the expiating of ſins] for a memoriall before God continually. What memoriall? that they were the men for whom the ſacrifice was offered; and that their ſins were purged thereby, that God ſhould therefore have them in remembrance to preſerve them from the Curſe and judgment of the Law, for ſo it followeth, *And Aaron ſhall bear the judgment of the Children of Iſrael upon his heart continually*, ver. 29, 30. Theſe things were but figuratively done in *Aaron*, but really and fully accompliſhed in Chriſt his Antitype, who being conſtituted our High Prieſt, and having received Command from the Father not onely what but for whom to offer, even for *Iſrael*, i. e. the elect of God, (which for a great part) were not yet in being, hath by his own blood entred into the Holy place, with their names engraven upon his heart, having purchaſed for them an everlaſting Redemption. Not into the Holy place made with hands, but into Heaven there to appear for them by way of Mediation and Interceſſion, *Heb.* 9. 12, 24. *Rom.* 8. 34. Wherefore alſo God hath given him not onely an acquittance for them from all their ſins, *Heb.* 10. 17. but hath alſo given and delivered up them into his hands, as hath been before proved, and Mr. *B.* himſelf confeſſeth, yet not as he inſinuateth, to plague and Curſe them, and hold them during life under the intolerable bondage of the Law; but to deale with them in a gentle diſpenſation, according to the tenor of the Covenant of Grace, in tender mercy to draw them unto and keep them in the Faith without all Apoſtacy, to the end. All which he performeth to all his elect, as is evident from moſt of thoſe Scriptures which were brought for the confirmation of the former point, and elſwhere, Gods giving them to Chriſt, and into his diſpenſation, being their perfect tranſlation from the Covenant of the Law, into the Covenant of Grace: And this was done before their beleeving. *All that the Father giveth me ſhall come to me*, firſt they are given, and then they ſhall come. *Be not afraid, but ſpeak, and hold not thy peace, for I have much people in this City*, ſaid the Lord

Lord Jeſus to *Paul* of the *Corinthians*, yet Heathen, *Acts* 18. 9, 10. They were his people before, therefore muſt they be gathered to him by Faith. *I have other ſheep which are not of this fold: them alſo I muſt bring, and they ſhall hear my voyce*, &c. Jo: 10. 16. he means the *Gentiles* that were infidels yet, nevertheleſs his ſheep that muſt afterward hear his voice, becauſe they were his ſheep, how were theſe termed Chriſts people, Chriſts ſheep, while yet in Paganiſm, idolatry and unbeleef, but becauſe they were his redeemed and juſtified ones? *Ye beleeve not, becauſe ye are not of my ſheep*, Jo: 10. 26. What is that, but becauſe they were not of the number of them for whoſe ſins he had effectually ſatisfied Gods juſtice.

3 Juſtification and Remiſſion of ſins may be conſidered alſo as it is brought into their own apprehenſion and Conſcience, that were juſtified by Chriſt, and in Chriſt before. And in this ſenſe it is oftenest taken in Scriptures, yea alway when we are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith. This is done when Chriſt by the manifeſtation and miniſtry of the Goſpel maketh known in all ages to them for whoſe ſins he hath ſatisfied, the Myſtery of Grace by him, and frameth their hearts with all gladnes by Faith to embrace him and it thorow him, unto Juſtification. Then are they juſtified in themſelves, and remiſſion of ſins ſealed up by the ſpirit to their own Conſciences, and ſo have the Kingdom of God within them, conſiſting of Peace, Righteouſnes, and Joy in the Holy Ghoſt. Before this Chriſt had life for them, now they are ſaid to have it themſelves, *Jo:* 20. 31. 1 *Jo:* 5. 12. Untill now was their winter ſeaſon, ſo that all their life was in Chriſt as the Vine or Root, now is their ſpring, ſo that the life ſheweth it ſelf in them as the branches bloſſoming with peace and joy unto all obedience. Before life was purchaſed and ſeizure thereof taken for them by Chriſt: Now they are paſſed from death to life, 1 *Jo:* 3. 14. *i. e.* are put into the actuall poſſeſſion of it. Before though they were Lords of all (as the Apoſtle in a caſe little different from this ſpeaketh, *Gal.* 4. 1, 2.) yet differed nothing from Servants, being (in their own apprehenſion) under the threats and condemnation of the Law, and ſo ſtill in ſlaviſh fears and terrors. But now they ſee their freedom and take poſſeſſion of it, with boldneſs to cry *Abba Father*, and to enter into the Holieſt by the blood of Jeſus, and through the veil of his fleſh, with full aſſurance of hope, *&c.* Hebrewes 10. 19, 20.

Theſe things ſo premiſſed, we ſhall the better ſee whether the Scriptures which Mr. *Baxter* here produceth, do by their own force, or elſe by his miſ-interpretation of them ſeem to prove that the Elect while unbeleevers, are under the Law as a Covenant of works. Firſt that of *Joh.* 3. 18. is a threat of the Goſpel Covenant againſt the Contemners of it and of Chriſt the preacher thereof, and not of the Law Covenant. And it is brandiſhed againſt reprobats and not againſt elect unbeleevers. Chriſt had now preached his Goſpel a while in *Galilee*; the elect beleeved, and of them ſaith Chriſt *they are not condemned.* The reprobates would not beleeve; of them he ſaith, *they are condemned already*: and the reaſon is rendred, not becauſe they have broken the morall Law, but *becauſe they have not beleeved in the Name of the onely begotten Son of God. This is the condemnation that* [Chriſt the] *light is come into the world, and men preferred their own darknes before him*, &c. The ſame alſo is the meaning of the 36 ver. which he citeth. Neither of theſe pointing in their threat to the elect but the reprobates among unbeleevers. Neither threatening for Contumacy againſt the Law but the Goſpel. Therefore nothing here proveth the elect before they beleeve to be under the Law, as a Covenant of works.

Again thoſe Scriptures which he ſaith bid us to beleeve for the remiſſion of ſinnes, *Act.* 2 38, &c. do only prove that faith in Chriſt doth juſtifie the elect in the third conſideration of Juſtification or remiſſion of ſinns before mentioned, *viz.* as it evidenceth and brings home into their apprehenſion and Conſcience that their ſinns are remitted. For ſo run the words, in that 10 of *Act. v.* 47. that *Whoſoever beleeveth in him ſhall receive remiſſion of ſins*; not denying that Chriſt had received it for them before, but affirming only that now they ſhould receive it from Chriſt. Beſides, this promiſe is held forth there promiſcuouſly to all both elect and reprobate, and it is but an offer not the gift of pardon, to diſtinguiſh betwixt them for whom Chriſt had and thoſe for whom he had not effectually ſatisfied and received abſolution from the Father, by the ones beleeving and receiving by faith from the hand of Chriſt, the pardon, and the others refuſall and manifeſting thereby their abode under death and the Law ſtill. The ſurety had paid the penalty of the obligation, taken up the bonds, and acquittance or diſcharge of the debt. Thenceforth the Creditor had no more plea againſt either principall or ſurety. Nevertheles the principall knew it not, therefore playeth leaſt in ſight, is in continual fear of arreſts, thinks every buſh hath a Sergeant or

or Bayliff under it; but at length the ſurety gives and delivers into his hand both the acquittance,& the obligation Cancelled. Now is his firſt receiving of a diſcharge, now he firſt finds himſelf free from his Creditors obligation,now hath he the firſt comfort of the benefit; but he was diſcharged before, though he knew it not; ſo is it with the elect, &c. Therefore Mr. *Baxters* inference hence is unſound.

He addeth the Teſtimony of *Paul*, Eph. 2. 3. *That the redeemed were by nature the Children of wrath:* who denyeth it? But this is nothing to the queſtion. It is not here enquired whether the redeemed drew not the ſeeds of ſin and death by naturall propagation from their parents, as much as others: But whether by the ſatisfaction which Chriſt made for them, according to the Covenant of grace, they were not redeemed from that wrath before they yet beleeved. It is true what *Mephiboſheth* ſaid of himſelf and his brethren, to *David*, *We were all as dead men before my Lord the King*,&c. 2 Sam. 19. 28. becauſe they were the progeny of *Saul* that fought againſt *David*. Nevertheles by means of the Covenant that intervened between *David* and *Jonathan*, *Mephiboſheth* had right to all the favour that King *David* could expreſs.

As for thoſe teſtimonies cited by way of *Theſis* and *Antitheſis*, out of *Gal.* 5. *ver.* 3, 4. *&* *ver.* 18, 23. they make wholly againſt him, nothing for him. The 3 & 4 verſes, ſpeak nothing to the queſtion in hand, but utterly deſtroy that to which in this whole diſpute he driveth, nothing to the queſtion in hand. *The circumciſed are bound* or debtors *to the whole Law, and Chriſt is become of none effect to them.* He was to have proved that beleevers, were before they beleeved under the Law. This Text ſpeaketh not of the elect before they beleeved, but of profeſſed beleevers returning to Circumciſion and the Law, to fetch thence help unto their juſtification after that they ſeemingly at leaſt beleeved in Chriſt: ſo here is nothing that makes for him, becauſe nothing to the preſent queſtion. But much againſt him in reference to the grand thing which he laboureth for, to bring beleevers under the Law as a Covenant of works. Whoſoever doth ſo ſaith the Apoſtle in the leaſt mite, that contents not himſelf with Chriſt alone, takes in but ſo poor a peice of the Law as Circumciſion to help with Chriſt to Juſtification, the ſame perſon hereby forfeiteth all his claim to Grace and Chriſt, and muſt gain heaven by his perfect fullfilling of the Law, or muſt be damned in hell for ever. Into this ſtate Mr. *Baxter* ſtriveth to bring himſelf and his diſ-

ciples. I ſhall not wiſh them joy in it, becauſe I uſe not to wiſh impoſſibilities. Touching the verſes which he puts in oppoſition to theſe, *ver.* 18, 23. *But if ye be led by the Spirit ye are not under the Law, againſt ſuch there is no law.* If he mean ſimply and ſincerely what the Apoſtle here meaneth by being *led by the Spirit*, viz. the ſeeking of righteouſnes by Chriſt alone, as the ſame Apoſtle more fully expreſſeth himſelf, *Gal.* 3. 3. *Phil.* 3. 3. Then by granting that ſuch are not under the Law, there is no law againſt them; he deſtroyeth and recanteth all that he hath before ſpoken to prove beleevers under the Law. But if by being led by the Spirit, his aim be to bring in works to juſtification under the name of the fruits of the Spirit, we ſhall here forbear to anſwer him, becauſe it is beſides the preſent queſtion, leaving it to its fit place where he openly explaineth himſelf.

And no leſs abhorrent from the queſtion is his next proof, *Gal.* 3. 22. *The Scripture hath concluded all under ſin, that the promiſe by faith in Jeſus Chriſt may be given to them that beleeve.* What is this to the purpoſe in hand? we deny not the promiſe of, or the promiſed Juſtification and remiſſion of ſinns, by faith in Jeſus Chriſt to be given to them that beleeve, into their hands and poſſeſſion when they beleeve, by affirming that Chriſt hath taken poſſeſſion thereof for them before they beleeve, that he may let it down into their hearts when they beleeve. *He aſcended up on high, and led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men.* Eph. 4. 8. The Apoſtle fetcheth his authority from the word in *Pſal.* 68. 18. where it is ſaid, *He received gifts for men*, viz. to give them in his time. But the Apoſtle contents himſelf with the ſcope of the word, not binding himſelf to the bare letter and ſound thereof. So Chriſt at his aſcenſion received for us the gifts of Juſtification, and remiſſion, and all other benefits of his paſſion; They were then laid up for us in his Cuſtody, ſo that we had them in him before our actuall exiſtence upon earth. But he gives them to us into our ſenſible poſſeſſion, when we come to be, to live and to beleeve.

That which he citeth from *Gal.* 4, 5 is altogether beſides the queſtion alſo. Himſelf acknowledgeth that it proveth us onely to be under the Law when Chriſt redeemed us, or undertook to pay our ranſom. Not that we were under the Law after he had redeemed us by paying our ranſom, before we yet beleeved. The words are theſe in the 4 & 5 verſes; *God ſent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law.* The ſcope of the Apoſtle

postle here, is one and the same with that to which he drives, *Gal.* 2. 15, 16. *We who are Jewes by nature,* [a holy seed, within the Covenant, and have all the privileges of the Law] *and not sinners of the Gentiles* [that are without the Covenant and the Law] *knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ; even we have beleeved that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law, for by the works of the law no flesh is justified.* Why then do we draw the poor Gentiles to seek any furtherance to their justification, by the observation of the Law, by which our selves who were most privileged with it could not be justified but by Christ onely without the law? So here, Even they that had the law and were not a little zealous for and active in the righteousness of the law, had need of a redeemer, were justified and saved not at all by the lawes righteousnes, but onely by Christs redeeming of them: What madnes is it then in you O foolish *Galatians*, that are not of the holy stock of *Israel*, but sinners of the Gentiles to seek any help to your justification by the works of the law, which could not justifie the very *Israelites* that were born and brought up in it: and not to repose your selves upon Christ alone? Mr. *Baxter* will pretend any other meaning of the Text besides, he shall therein wound and not strengthen his Cause. For he speaks of the same persons here, to be under the law onely in the hand of a Mediator, not under the Curse of the law, but under such an administration thereof, that even before they actually beleeved in Christ, the very person of Christ, are affirmed *ver.* 1. to be Lords of all, all the inheritance which is by Christ; *ergo* not under the wrath of God before they embraced the Faith of Christ.

As for the other Scriptures which he annexeth yet further to prove, that the very elect before and untill they beleeve, are under the Law in the sense so oft manifested; let him once shew how he will argue, and what he will conclude, and upon what grounds, from them; we shall be ready to answer him. In the interim I profess I see not any thing in them more prevalent to his purpose, than nights lodging in a bed of snow and ice, to cure the Cough.

Yet from all these wrested Scriptures he Concludes at last, that the deliverance which beleevers have by Christ from the Curse of the Law, is a conditionall deliverance, *viz.* if they will obey the Gospel, *i.e.* when they beleeve, if they will beleeve, not onely while they live, but also when they are dead and buried. For as we say that a conditionall proposition doth *nihil ponere*, so it is true in the sense

ſenſe of Mr *Bax.* here, that this conditionall promiſe doth *nihil* mittere. The Condition as long as this world laſteth being ſtill performing not performed, and ſo nothing obteined. Yet will have this new nothing together with the abrogation of the ceremoniall Law, (to which we never were, none but the *Iſraelites* ever have been ſubject) to be the great privilege of beleevers and effect Chriſts bloud. When we poor ſouls with our dull eyes, can ſ no more privilege that we have herein by *Chriſts bloud*, than the wo of infidells and reprobates have, for they alſo have this conditional deliverance from the curſe, and freedom from the ceremoniall l *And this deliverance* (ſaith he) *is yet more full, when we perform conditions of our freedom; And then we are ſaid to dead to the Law*, Rom. 4. and the obligation to *puniſhment dead, as to us*, ver. 6. This is indeed a full and perfect deliverance. But what doth he mean in ſaying *when we perform* &c. *either when we are performing the condition* That were a contradiction to himſelf in what he ſaith p. 74. that *are not perfectly freed till the day of reſurrection and judgement.* And alſo it will be hard for another ſave Mr. *Br.* to make ſenſe of t words. That the deliverance of beleevers is yet more full when th perform the Conditions, are performing the conditions of th freedom; *i.e.* more full *when they beleeve than when they do belee* For if we ſhould grant to Mr. *Br*, Faith to be a condition, and no rather a mean or inſtrument of our juſtification, yet would we gra him no other condition thereof. Or doth he mean, it is full wh they have performed the Conditions? it ſeems then that ſome of t Conditions are left to be performed in the next world, becauſe u till then he tells us we can have no ſuch perfect freedom.

This is the free Grace of God which Mr. *Br* boaſteth himſelf i much to extoll, p. 79. let him that delights in it, be his diſciple That which he ſpeaks in the upſhott for the mitigation of his ha doctrine aforegoing; (that he knoweth this Covenant of wor continueth not to the ſame ends and uſes as before, &c.) is but trick of the Jeſuits, to give ſugar after the poyſon which was befo gone down to deſtroy. Neither can he make out how beleevers a under the law of nature as a Covenant of works, and yet not bou to ſeek life according to the tenor and condition of that Co nant.

If any marvell that Mr. *Baxter* ſhould ſo waſte his ſpirits in ab ſing both divine and humane learning to prove the Saints to be ſti under the Curſe, under the law as a Covenant of works, he wi

ceaſe

ase to wonder, if he take notice of a further aim that he hath erein. He would not out of doubt have so much insisted on it, d he not looked to a further end in it. If the beleevers are still un- er a Covenant of works, as to the Curse, wrath, and Condemna- on, much more are they under a Covenant of works as unto life nd Justification. If the former be once granted, he accounts the ame wonn as to the latter. Therefore doth he so much stirr in the ormer, that he may with the more facility and less contradiction, ring in afterwards the latter, Justification by works, which is his ery busines in Compiling this book.

CHAP. XI.

Whether as the Covenant of Works was made with all mankind in Adam *their representative, so the Covenant of Grace was made with all the elect in Christ their Representer? What relation the Covenants made with* Adam, Abraham, *the* Israelites, *and lastly with us under the Gospel have to that Covenant made with Christ.*

B. Thesis 14. p. 89.

THE Tenor of the New Covenant is this, that Christ having made sufficient satisfaction to the Law, whosoever will repent and beleeve in him to the end, shall be justified through that satisfaction from all that the Law did charge upon them, and be moreover advanced to far greater privileges and glory then they fell from: But whosoever fullfilleth not these conditions, shall have no more benefit, by the bloud of Christ, than what they here received and abused, but must answer the charge of the Law themselves; And for their neglect of Christ, must also suffer a far greater condemnation. Or briefly, whosoever beleeveth in Christ, shall not perish but have everlasting life; but he that beleeveth not shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him, Mar. 16.16. Jo.3. 15, 16, 17, 18.36. & 5. 24. & 6 35,40.47. & 7.38. & 11. 25, 26. & 12.46. Act. 10. 43. Rom. 3. 26. & 4. 5. & 5. 1 & 10. 4, 10. 1 Jo. 5. 15. Mar. 1. 15. & 6. 12. Luk. 13.3. 5. & 24. 47. Act. 5. 31. & 11. 18. & 20. 21. & 2.38. & 3.19. & 8. 22. & 26.20. Rev. 2. 5, 16. Heb.6. 1. 2 Pet. 3. 9.

Mr. Br

Mr. *Br* having (as he thinks) laid proſtrate the whole generation of Chriſt, and antipapiſticall beleevers under the Curſe, under the wrath of God, ſticks as cloſe to them, as the vulture to the carkas, or the beetle to the doung, or the fleſh-fly to the ſore. For here again he coucludes that the very Tenor of the New Covenant is that notwithſtanding Chriſts ſufficient ſatisfaction made to the law, they muſt remain unjuſtified, unpardoned, under ſin, under vengeance to the end, and then poſſibly after many hundreds and it may be thouſands of yeers wherein their bodies have laid under rottenneſs, and their ſouls under all hell-torments which the law can inflict, they ſhall be juſtified. And this (very probably) ſhall be about that time when *Origens* reprobates and devills ſhall ariſe from hell and fly away thence all at once and together to heaven. For whoſoever is not juſtified and pardoned here in this life, ſhall ſurely not attain it untill that St *Nevers day* of *Origen*. But to this it hath been anſwered already. He ſeems now to bring ſome new thing, and that which every beleeving ſoul gaſpeth to hear made out in its fullneſs *viz*. What the Tenor of the New Covenant is. *viz*. *That whoſoever will repent and beleeve to the end, ſhall be juſtified after the end.*

When the Serpent hath got his head into the hole the body alſo, by little and little followes. Erewhile it was, *he that beleeveth to the end*, now it is, *he that repenteth to the end, and beleeveth to the end, that ſhall be after all ends and worlds juſtified.* Yet this is but the head and neck of the Serpent. The bulk and belly are behinde, and the ſame full of all the qualifications and good works that Mr. *Br* can deviſe, or all the herds of Monks and Jeſuits have deviſed to his hands. Theſe all muſt be according to Mr. *Baxters* Goſpel, as effectuall unto faith, or Chriſt himſelf to Juſtification. I ſhould but preoccupate a diſpute here to examine whether repentance be one of the many thouſand conditions of Juſtification which Mr. *Br* in the ſequele of this Treatiſe holds neceſſary to Juſtification. I ſhall therefore leave the handling thereof to its due place. Onely by the way, if by repentance Mr. *Br* here meaneth any thing heterogeneous, or ſpecifically diſtinct from faith, I affirm and ſhall in its place make good, that this his aſſertion is totally Popiſh, againſt the doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

As for the Scriptures which he doth here roll out in a Crowd without rank or file to prove it; partly becauſe he neither alleageth the words, nor ſhews how he would argue from them, partly becauſe his ſhuffling them together in Cluſters, tends onely to make

he labour of his anſwerer almoſt intolerable, to ſhew particularly ow little each Scripture makes for him, and how much many of hem againſt him; partly becauſe he doth ſtill reſerve to himſelf, whatſoever be ſaid in anſwer] an advantage to evade, by telling that the force of that Scripture doth in another way, and not in hat to which we have anſwered, prove for him; but principally ecauſe he quotes the ſame Scriptures over and over again in ano- ar place more proper, where it ſhall be more pertinent to anſwer hem, I ſhall therefore here forbear to ſpeak to them, leſt I ſh uld here be forced to omit it, or to ſay over again what had been here id before: Nay himſelf will not have them to be anſwered here, r he ſpeaks ſo ambiguouſly, that he will not have his meaning un- ſtood, telling us onely that upon theſe Conditions (forſooth) erformed, we ſhall be juſtified in another world, but doth not let know from him whether upon performance of them we may be ſtified in the preſent world. But he paſſeth to the explication.

Explication.

Bax. *Chriſts ſatisfaction to the Law, goes before the New Covenant though not in regard of its payment, (which was in the fullnes of time) yet in regard of the undertaking, acceptance and efficacy. There could be no treating on new terms till the old obligation was ſatisfied and ſuſpended.*

I account them not worth the confuting, who tell us that Chriſt is the onely party conditioned with, and that the New Covenant as to us, hath no conditions. (ſo Saltmarſh *&c.) The place that they alleage for this aſſertion is that* Jer. 31. 31, 32, 33. *cited in* Heb. 8. 8, 9, 10. *Which place conteineth not the full tenor of the whole New Covenant, but either it is called the New Covenant, becauſe it expreſſeth the nature of the benefits of the New Covenant, as they are offered on Gods part, without mentioning mans conditions. (that being not pertinent to the buſines the Prophet had in hand) Or els it ſpeaketh onely what the Lord will do with his elect, in giving them the firſt Grace, and enabling them to perform the Conditions of the New Covenant; and in that ſenſe may be called a New Covenant alſo; as I have ſhewed before* p. 7, 8. *though properly it be a prediction, and belong onely to Gods will of purpoſe and not to his legiſlative will.*

But thoſe men erroneouſly think that nothing is a condition, but what is to be performed by our own ſtrength. But if they will be-

leeve Scripture, the places before alleaged will prove, that the New Covenant hath Conditions on our part as well as the old.

Some benefit from Chriſt did the condemned here receive at the delay of their condemnation, and many more mercies, though they turned them all into greater judgements, but of this more when we treat of generall redemption.

I ſhall here propound ſome queſtions to Mr. *Baxter*, about his own words to be anſwered by ſome of his Chaplains or Diſciples. For I am not ſo ambitious as to expect his ſtooping in perſon to ſo low an office. 1 Whether Chriſts ſatisfaction to the law were undertaken and ſo virtually made, without an agreement between the Father and the Son, that the Son ſhould give, and the Father accept ſuch ſatisfaction? Mr. *Br* ſo great a Maſter of reaſon, who hath ſacrificed all his religion to reaſon, can judge whether this could rationally (if poſſibly) be done. 2 If by agreement whether this agreement was not by way of Covenant between the Father and the Son? and ſo whether the whole buſines of mans juſtification were not tranſacted and concluded upon, firſt between the Father and the Son? 3 Whether Chriſt undertook to give ſatisfaction or the Father to accept it for any other beſides thoſe that in time have or ſhall have the full benefit thereof? I mean, beſides the elect whom the Son muſt perfectly know becauſe he was in the boſom of the Father, and was thorowly acquainted with all his boſom ſecrets? 4 Whether any one can miſſe of the benefit of this ſatisfaction, when it is once ſo given and accepted for him by name? 5 Why Mr. *Br* ſpeaking of the payment of this ſatisfaction, doth not plainly mention the time when it was made, namely, the fullneſs of time: in the very ſame breath ſpeaking of the undertaking, acceptance, and efficacy thereof, doth not alſo name the time when this was Covenanted and Concluded upon? Did he not ſee that it was needfull to the Compleating of this member of the ſentence, in full equipage with the former, to name the time of this as well as of that? Was it a beare or an evill Conſcience in the way that put him to ſuch an Apoſiopeſis? that ſhook him into a dumbneſs, when truth, honeſty and plain dealing bad him ſpeak out? Whether he had ſaid before all time, or ſhortly upon the beginning of time, he ſaw he ſhould have given a deathly wound, either to his Cauſe, or to his Credit, or to both; therefore like a cunning ſophiſter, ſtops his breath, and ſpeaks nothing. 6 And if the Covenant of grace in all and every of its Articles were thus agreed upon between

Father and the Son, either before the actuall exiſtence of any man in the world, or as Mr. *Br* here Confeſſeth, before *Adam* and *Eve* the ſole perſons then exiſtent upon earth were treated with about it, how then doth he add, that he accounts him not worth the Conſuting, which tell us, that Chriſt was the onely party conditioned with, and that the New Covenant, as to us, hath no Conditions (ſo *Saltmarſh* &c.) thus Caſting an Odium upon this opinion, as if Mr. *Saltmarſh* and his Diſciples alone held it, and that never any before him thought of it?

For my own part, where the Scriptures are ſilent, I am in great dread to be loquent; and where the word ſpeaketh ſparingly and darkly, I dare not to conclude too peremptorily. Neither in points that are controvertible in religiõ, but which way ſoever decided, do not Confer much to, or detract from the Baſis and foundation of our ſalvation, would I proſecute either vehement or endles diſputes. Every leaſt truth in Divinity is precious indeed, therefore not to be betrayed, but to be preſerved more carefully than our life & bloud. Yet our life and bloud ought not to be ſo deer to us as the Peace of the Churches of Chriſt. And the diſturbing of the Churches peace may ſometimes more obſcure the honour of the Goſpel, than the ſuſpending of the defence of ſome not very important truths, for a while, could have done. I ſhould not therefore quarrell againſt them that aſcribe to the New Covenant its Condition, and make faith alone as it inſtrumentally receiveth Chriſt, the onely Condition of our being juſtified to and in our ſelves. I ſee not ſo great eclipſe upon the glory of Gods Grace or Chriſts merits cauſed by ſuch an aſſertion, that we ſhould diſturb the peace of the Churches about it, were it not that the Papiſts and Arminians by this unſcripturall phraſe do ſeek totally to corrupt the doctrine of juſtification.

Nevertheles Mr. *Baxters* contumelious words ſhall not affright me from delivering my judgement what I think moſt probable, and moſt agreeing with holy Scripture touching the point in hand. Yet laying it down not as abſolute and certain, but as that which is yet moſt probable to me untill I ſhall by further enquiry into the Scriptures, or by the help of others, that have more enquired, ſee cauſe to judge otherwiſe. As for Mr. *Baxter*, though in humane literature, and in things ſubject to the tryall of reaſon, I hold his judgement not Contemptible, but equall with the moſt, yea the beſt; yet in Goſpel and ſpirituall things, I finde him ſo ſtupified,

perverted, and wholly spoyled with Philosophy, seeing so little of the mystery of Christ, yea so prejudiced against the sacred things which he knowes not, that I account him one of those whom the Apostle describeth 1 *Tim.* 1. 17. Desiring to be teachers of the Law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm. And therefore am so little affrighted from any doctrine of this kinde; by his abasing thereof, that I am the more induced to search into it if it be not a pearl indeed, because he hath trampled it. I shall then express what I think in these following positions.

First as God hath made two great and generall Covenants with mankind, each of them comprizing other & lesser Covenants under it: So because there were not existent personally (at the time of making these covenants) the singular individuals of mankind to whom these Covenants belonged, therefore did he appoint 2 publike persons, each such then existing when either Covenant was made, to be (as they were) representatives of all the singular persons, that then did or after should exist to be under either Covenant, with whom when the Covenants were concluded, they should be in perfect force for or against all that were represented in their severall ages, as though they had been but then made particularly with them in their own persons. The one of these Covenants is usually termed the Covenant of works, the other the Covenant of grace. The publike or common person Covenanted with in the one was the first *Adam*, in the other the second *Adam* Christ Jesus. The case is cleer in respect of the first *Adam*, and the Covenant of works. Mr. *Br* himself grants every inch of it. That whatsoever law or positive Commands were given to *Adam*, whatsoever promises in cases of performance, or threats in case of breach, were added, all pertained as full to all the future progeny of *Adam*, as represented in him, and enclosed in his loins, as to *Adam* himself. And accordingly while *Adam* stood we stood in him, when he fell we fell in him and with him, as deep under the wrath of God as himself. I forbear to prove any of this, because it is granted on all sides. But the question is wholly about Christ the second *Adam*, whether the Covenant of grace was so made with him, as the Covenant of works with *Adam?* and what that Covenant of grace was? I conceive that both there was such a Covenant between the Father and the Son in reference to us, and that this was the tenor thereof: *viz.* that the Son in time appointed should assume to himself our nature, and in it represent the persons of the elect that were equally sinners and condemned with others

thers in *Adam*; that he ſhould offer himſelf in our fleſh a ſacrifice for ſinn; that upon his undertaking thereof the ſinns of all the elect ſhould be pardoned, and they of ſinners ſhould be made righteous, and delivered up into his hands, no more to be accounted to *Adam*, but to Chriſt, and to be preſerved in the boſom of his grace & love to eternall glory. And (as Mr. *Br* acknowledgeth) upon Chriſts undertaking &c. The ſatisfaction was ſo virtually and effectually made by Chriſt and accepted by the Father as when it was actually accompliſhed. Firſt it ſeems there was ſuch a Covenant; For the Apoſtle tells us, *Rom.*5. 14. that *Adam* was a figure of him that was to come, which is Chriſt. And how a figure? Doubtles not onely in this that as by him the one and firſt man, ſin and death by ſin immediately came upon all men: ſo by Chriſt, righteouſnes, and by it life came upon all the elect: But alſo in the manner of the agreement of the Type and Antitype together. That as *Adam* repreſenting all mankinde, by his unfaithfullnes in breaking the Covenant brought ſin and death upon all that he repreſented: ſo Chriſt repreſenting all the elect, by his faithfullnes in performing the Covenant &c. brought righteouſnes and juſtification of life upon all the elect repreſented in him. Yea the Holy Ghoſt in expreſſe words teſtifieth to ſuch a Covenant. *In the volume of thy book it is written of me that I ſhould do thy will O God*, ſaith he when he comes into the world, *i.e.* it is teſtified in the word what Covenant hath paſſed betwixt thee and me &c. *Heb.* 10. 5—10. yea and teſtifieth to the tenor of the Covenant, his coming with a body to be offered in ſacrifice: this will of God he came to do. And moreover he giveth witnes alſo to the faithfullnes of Chriſt in offering it, *Lo I come*; and to the efficacy of it upon all immediately for whom it was offered; By the which will we are ſanctified, *i. e.* no more taken for ſinners, but Conſecrated as holy to the Lord through the offering of the body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all, *ibid.* The ſame is implyed in that phraſe which here termeth the offering of Chriſts body *the doing of the Fathers will.* And elſwhere *obedience unto death even the death of the Croſs*, Phil. 2. 8. Obedience and will preſuppoſe Command and Covenant. And the δι ἑνὸς δικαιώματος, the one righteouſnes or one act of righteouſnes of Chriſt, oppoſed to the δι ἑνὸς παραπτώματος, that one offence of *Adam*, (for ſo the phraſe ſeems to me to hold out more grammatically, than the offence of one and the righteouſnes of one:) doth not obſcurely argue that one righteouſnes of Chriſt in fullfilling, oppoſite to that one offence of *A-*

dam

dam in once breaking the Covenant, *Rom.* 5. 18. And that all this was covenanted to be done and accepted for and in the behalf of the elect, and to them and none but them to be effectuallized, is alſo evident from the Scriptures. For he did the will of his Father in offering himſelf as was before ſhewed; *i. e.* did according as it was agreed and covenanted between him and the Father, dyed for them onely for whom he made prayers and interceſſions. But when his time was come to ſuffer he prayed & interceded not for the world, but for them onely whom the Father had given him out of the world, *Joh.* 17. 6, 9. Therefore for them onely he undertook to ſatisfie. Therefore is it that he is ſaid to lay down his life [onely] for his ſheep, not for the goats, *Joh.* 10. 11, 15. *For them whoſe names were written in the book of life of the Lamb ſlain from the foundation of the world*, Rev. 13. 8. The reſt things conteined in this poſition are granted by Mr. *Br* himſelfe, therefore need no proof here. I have couched together many things in this, to avoyd multiplicity of poſitions.

2 That by force of this ſatisfaction ſo given and accepted for the ſinns of the Elect, according to the Tenor of this Covenant between the Father and the Son, all the Elect of God were Juſtified in Chriſt from the very time of Chriſts undertaking to be their Juſtifier. Therefore in the laſt alleaged Scripture their names are ſaid to be written in the book of life of the Lamb ſlain from the foundation of the world. Here though the book of life which is elſwhere mentioned to be Gods book will be taken by Mr. *Br* to be the book of Election, yet this book of life of the lamb is to be underſtood for the book of Juſtification, implying indeed the election of all that are written therein, but primarily and in its direct ſenſe comprehending the names of them that are juſtified by the bloud of the ſacrificed Lamb of God. And theſe are ſaid to be written in Chriſts book, that is regiſtred in Chriſt, and upon Chriſts account from the foundation of the world, immediately upon Chriſts undertaking to ſatisfie for them. *Of him ye are in Chriſt*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *who of God is made unto us Wiſdome, Righteouſnes, Sanctification and Redemption*, 1 Cor. 1. 30. When was he ſo made unto us? Mr. *Br* anſwereth, not onely upon the payment but upon his undertaking to pay our debt. Therefore is he ſaid to be *Jeſus Chriſt yeſterday, and to day, and for ever*, Heb. 13. 8. And that not onely in reference to them that lived in all ages of the world, but in reſpect of us alſo, that in all ages of the world he hath been, and will be what now he is our Je-

ſus

ſus our Chriſt. But this poſition hath been before proved in the former Chapter, in anſwer to Mr. *Baxters* 13 *Theſis* and its explication, where I ſpake to his ſixth Argument.

3 The Miniſteriall way of offering and convaying the benefits of Chriſts ſatisfaction into the ſouls and apprehenſions of men, now uſed under the Goſpel, according to the command of Chriſt, is or at leaſt ſounds like an inferior Covenant, ſubordinate and ſub-ſervient to this between the Father and the Son, whereof we have ſpoken. Chriſt having now made full ſatisfaction to the Father, invites all, and brings in his elect, to taſte and enjoy by faith all the perfections which he hath merited and received into his hands for them. It is confeſſed by Mr. *B. Theſ.* 8. *That God is ſo fully pleaſed with the Sons undertaking of this buſines of Mediation, that he hath delivered all things into his hands, and given him all power in heaven and in earth, and made him Lord both of the dead and living. And the Lord Jeſus himſelf affirmeth, that the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son,* i. e. *the diſpenſation and ordering of all things in heaven and in earth.* And it is the opinion of great Divines, that the Lord Chriſt in the old world before the Law, and in all ages under the Law, being that perſon of the Trinity, which had undertaken to aſſume our nature unto him, and in it to dye for the reconciling of us to God, and entring from the beginning upon his power, to ſet in order all things to this glorious end; was he that converſed with the Patriarks and Prophets, ſometimes in an aſſumed body like a man, ſometimes inviſibly, making known the myſtery of Redemptiou by himſelf to them, and preſcribing under what adminiſtrations he would have his Church governed untill his coming. That it was he who firſt preached to *Adam* ſalvation by the ſeed of the Woman, and afterward more cleerly to *Abraham.* That it was he alſo which delivered the Law upon Mount *Sinai,* and added there a ſecond Covenant, in ſhew and ſound a meer Covenant of works, (*Do and be Bleſſed, Sin and be Curſed*) which Covenant alone is expreſly called the Old Covenant, and is indeed now repealed, and aboliſhed from being any more a Covenant, ſaving to them that put themſelves under it. This was but a temporary Covenant, an Appendix to the Covenant before made with *Abraham*; and both this and that with *Abraham* were but ſubordinate Covenants to that before mentioned between God and Chriſt. Here now all that were juſtified before Chriſts coming in the fleſh, were juſtified in Chriſt by force of the firſt Covenant made between

he

the Father and the Son. The promiſe to *Adam*, and the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and with the Iſraelites, together with all the Sacraments and ſignes annexed to all theſe, tended onely to bring them that were juſtified before in Chriſt to a reall and ſenſible participation of it and the comforts thereof, by Faith within their own conſciences: So is it now under the Goſpel adminiſtration. That firſt Covenant is that by which our juſtification is compleatly finiſhed in Chriſt; the preaching of Faith in a Covenant way, tends onely to this, that as many as were before juſtified in Chriſt, may by Faith have their Juſtification declared and evidenced to their conſciences, to fill them with joy unſpeakable and full of glory, and with that peace which paſſeth all underſtanding. Not but that Chriſt could without any ſuch Sub-Covenanting have filled up his elect with all the marrow and myſtery of Juſtification, by immediate Revelation from himſelf, as he dealt with *Paul* the Apoſtle: but that this way made moſt for his and his Fathers glory, both in them that are ſaved and in them that periſh.

4 Faith it ſelf, (much leſs any other qualification, gift or act) is not a condition of Juſtification *in foro Dei*, there Chriſt hath pleaded our diſcharge by his blood, & ſtill maketh interceſſion for us, but a means or inſtrument by which we receive Chriſt Jeſus, and the righteouſnes or jnſtification that is in him to our ſelves for conſolation and ſalvation, *in foro conſcientiæ*, ſo ſtood the caſe in reſpect of the fore-mentioned under Covenant that of the Law. When the Lord Chriſt had publiſhed his Law upon Mount *Sinai*, and given to *Iſrael* by *Moſes* all his Judgments and Statutes, there now paſſeth a ſolemn Covenant betwixt Chriſt and them, the people alſo every one in perſon aſſenting gladly; to fulfill all that they might be bleſſed, or if in the leaſt point they ſhould fail, to yeeld themſelves curſed. This Covenant was made more viſibly and in every part more ſtrictly after the nature and rule of Covenants, then this under the Goſpel. Yet will any ſay that this perfect obedience ſo Covenanted, was a condition of their juſtification and ſalvation, without which none could be juſtified or ſaved: Then were all damned, for no one either did or could perfectly obey. Nay *it was added becauſe of tranſgreſſions*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 3. 19. *i. e.* as a means ſo to operate about ſin in the diſcovery of it, and the damnation that is by it, ſo alſo to convince men that they might be driven from all ſuppoſition of their own righteouſnes, and ſeek righteouſnes by Chriſt alone, in whom alone the elect

were

ſtified before this Covenant was made. In the ſame manner the
lding forth of juſtification now under the Goſpel, in the form
d likenes of a Covenant; *Beleeve and be ſaved, beleeve not and pe-
h for ever:* proveth not Faith to be the condition of the New
ovenant, (as hath been ſaid) even the whole preaching of ſal-
tion by Chriſt, and injoyning of Faith upon all to receive it, is
effect of that Firſt great Covenant of Grace between the Father
d the Son, and a part of Chriſts Propheticall Office which he
dertook in that Covenant to accompliſh, in undertaking the
ediatorſhip between God and Men. An effect of that firſt Cove-
nt I ſay. For ſo it was agreed that *All which the Father had given
Chriſt*, by him to be juſtified and ſaved, *ſhould come to him*, i. e. be-
eve in him, *Jo: 6.* 37. To this purpoſe it was Covenanted on the
ns part, *to ſeek and to ſave that which was loſt*, Luke 19. 10. to call
to him all to participate by Faith of the life, light, righteouſ-
ſs and ſalvation that he had received for them, *Iſa.* 55. 1. *Jo:* 7.
Mat. 11. 28. This was a part of his Propheticall Office, to diſ-
ver the treaſures of Grace in his heart, and to invite all to the
rticipation thereof. And then on the Fathers part it was Cove-
nted that he would draw to Chriſt all the Elect, all that he had
ven to Chriſt, that while the Goſpel ſounded in their ears, he
ould divinely by his Spirit teach and move their hearts, that
ey ſhall not but come to Chriſt, *Jo: 6.* 43, 44. And laſtly it is a-
eed on the Sons part again, that of all that the Father thus
ingeth to him, he muſt caſt out none, loſe none, but raiſe them
at the laſt day [to glorification] and the reaſon of all is an-
xed, *It is the Fathers will, i. e.* that which was Covenanted be-
een the Father and him in Heaven, and he came down from
aven, not to do his own will, *i. e.* any thing of his private will,
thout the conſent of his Father, *but the will of him that ſent him*,
. what was Covenanted between the Father and him, and con-
rrent with the will of both, *Jo: 6.* 37, 38, 39. Thus all that
hich Mr *B.* calleth the Covenant of Grace, is but an effect or an
rticle and branch of the Covenant made of old between God
d Chriſt. And Faith not ſo properly termed a condition of ju-
ication, as an inſtrument to apprehend the preſent comfort of
being before ours in Chriſt.

5 That this Covenant of Grace is abſolute, ſhall be the work of
e next Chapter to evince.

Chap. XII.

That Text of Jer: 31. 31, 32, 33, &c. *opened, and Mr.* Baxters *elusions by which he would evince that it proveth not a free and unconditionall Covenant answered: with some other Argumentations with Mr.* Baxter *about the same Question.*

I Now come to that Testimony of *Jer.* 31. 31, 32, 33. cited in *Heb.* 8. 8—10. against which Mr. *B.* so much excepteth. That New Covenant there mentioned is called the New Covenant, not in opposition to the Old Covenant made in the beginning with *Adam*, but in opposition to that Covenant made two thousand and six hundred years after at least, with *Israel* upon *Mount Sinai*. And that Covenant upon *Mount Sinai* is called the Old Covenant, not in opposition to the Cov: of Grace made [if not from eternity according to Mr. *B.* yet] by Mr *B.* acknowledgment almost 3000 years before, and in those thousands of years oft held out afresh and renewed: but in opposition to the Covenant of Grace as it is now held forth in a new form and administration under the Gospel. So that the two Covenants there mentioned are termed Old and New, not for their differing in substance, but for their different wayes of administration. The Church of *Israel* then, and the Churches of Christ now, are and were under the same Covenant of Grace in substance; but the Church then under a legall and the Church now under an Evangelicall and spirituall administration thereof. That was the old, this the new administration, and in respect hereof the same Covenant then and now are termed the Old and New Covenant. This is evident from the Text, *It shall come to passe* (saith the Lord) *that in those dayes I will make a New Covenant with* [*them*] *not such as I made with their Fathers when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which my Covenant they brake, though I were an Husband to them, saith the Lord. But this is the Covenant that I will make with* [*them*] *in those dayes, I will put my Lawes in their minds*, &c. *And I will be their God*, &c. *And they shall not teach every man his neighbour*, &c. *For I will be mercifull to their unrighteousnes, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.* Here Mr. *B.* must

1 Grant that the Old Covenant in this place mentioned, was

the Covenant of the Law given in the Wildernes. For this is expresly affirmed where it is said to be *made with their Fathers when the Lord took them by the hand to bring them out of the Land of Ægypt.*

And 2 Notwithstanding *Israel* being under the Covenant, they were not either wholly under a Covenant of works, or besides the Covenant of Grace. For the Apostle maketh these two phrases, to be *Aliens from the Common-wealth of Israel*, and *Strangers from the Covenant of Promise*, to sound one and the same thing, *Ephes.* 2. 12. and telleth us *that the Law* which was 430 years after, *could not null the Covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, so as to make the Promise of no effect:* but that after the addition of this Legall Covenant, that Gospel Covenant made with *Abraham*, and them in him, of blessednes by Christ the seed of *Abraham*, stood firm unto them still, *Gal.* 3. 17. This also will doubtles be granted.

3 That therefore the Gospel Covenant in this Scripture promised, is called a New Covenant, not in opposition to that made with *Abraham*, for that is the same with this here promised, onely that was confirmed of God in Christ to come, this in Christ already come; and yet in opposition to that legall administration of it, and additory Covenant of the Law 430 years after annexed.

4 That this additionall Covenant was that Pedagogy of the Law under which the Apostle affirmeth the *Jewes* (though Lords of all) to be kept untill the coming of Christ, in the third and fourth chapters to the *Galathians*. And it consisted partly of Ceremoniall Lawes and typicall Ordinances pointing to Christ that was to come, and obscurely teaching Christ and Faith in him: partly of the Morall Commandments, the observation whereof was injoined as a condition of attaining that blessednes before promised to *Abraham* in Christ, yet so as this condition, *If ye will obey*, was still in the hand of a Mediator, satisfying for disobedience, because no perfect obedience could be fulfilled. This Pedagogy or leading of the Jewish Church by the hand while it was a child in the knowledg of the mystery of salvation by Christ was needfull, it could not well be without the typicall Ordinances, which by Lectures read upon them by their teachers, might discover and seal up much of Christ to them. Neither could it well be without the promises and threats of the Law, while yet the Grace of the Lord Christ was veiled to them, that in the light joy and brightnes thereof they could not as the Saints now run the race of Gods Command-

ments of pure love without ſome mixture of ſervile fear.

5 It will hence then follow that the New Covenant here promiſed is termed a new Covenant, becauſe exempted from that additament of the Law.

1 From the Ceremoniall Law, which in its revealing of Chriſt veiled him, and let out but a dark ſhadow of him and the grace that is by him, ſo that there was need of a large expoſition upon every figure, Circumciſion, Paſſeover, Sacrifices, &c. Brother to teach Brother, and one Neighbour another what theſe things meant, and yet at laſt both teachers and learners remained exceeding dark in the myſtery of Chriſt. But it is otherwiſe with us under the Goſpel. *The ſhaddowes are vaniſhed and we have the very body which is Chriſt*, Col. 2. 17. *Our eyes have ſeen, we have heard with our ears, and our hands have handled the bread of life*, 1 Joh: 1. 1. All is made out to us cleerly by the Doctrine and Spirit of Chriſt. *The Law* (by which the Prophet ſpeaking in the tone of the *Iewes*, and in a phraſe which under that adminiſtration they beſt knew, understandeth the Goſpel and Law of the Spirit of life) *is written in our hearts, revealed and ſealed up to our Conſciences*. We need not ſay, *Who ſhall aſcend up to Heaven, or who ſhall diſcend to the deep?* &c. But the *word is nigh thee even in thy mouth and in thy heart, this is the word of Faith which we preach*, Rom. 10. 6—8. So that there is not ſo much need of brothers teaching brother, &c. becauſe all is held forth not in the ſhadow but in the clear light.

2 From the conditions of the morall Law, yea from all conditions which made that former adminiſtration of the Covenant terrible, becauſe conditions could not be performed. The New Covenant ſaith the Holy Ghoſt, ſhall be abſolute, not ſuch as was made with their Fathers, that might be broken; but free and abſolute, all begun and ended by the meer grace of God, *I will teach*, &c. *I will be their God, and they ſhall be my people, I will be mercifull to their unrighteouſnes, and their ſins and iniquity will I remember no more*. I am not ſo happy as to expreſs my ſelf in few words, nor ſo either reckles, or evilly ſubtle, as under a pretence of brevity to leave things in ambiguity for ſelf-ends. This I conceive to be the meaning of this text, and in theſe five Poſitions I have (*ſo calculo melioris judicij*) expreſſed what yet I conceive to be the truth about the Covenant of Grace, 1 between God and Chriſt, 2 between Chriſt and man.

To this laſt thing handled, that the Covenant of Grace in its pro-

reſent adminiſtration is free and not conditionall, otherwiſe then have before granted, the Apoſtle giveth purpoſely his ſuffrage, affirming the Covenant made to *Abraham* is that which now ſtands in force, that the Law was but a temporary additament to it, to remain onely till the promiſed ſeed ſhould come, he means ſo to remain as to make the Covenant conditionall. The Law therefore being in this reſpect done away, the Covenant abides free and abſolute. *In thee, in thy ſeed, all Nations ſhall be bleſſed,* Gal. 3. 8, 16, 17, 18. This Covenant is free, abſolute, laden with no ſuch conditions as might make the hope of bleſſednes uncertain.

The evaſions which Mr. *B.* uſeth to elude the authority of this Scripture, are meerly Sophiſticall, having no footing upon other Scriptures, and totally croſſing the purpoſe of the Holy Ghoſt in this Scripture. *It conteineth not* (ſaith he) *the full tenor of the whole New Covenant.* Where then ſhall we find it, if not where the Holy Ghoſt undertaketh profeſſedly to declare both what this New Covenant is not, and what it is? *This is the Covenant* ſaith the Holy Ghoſt, *Nay it is but a peece or morſell of it,* ſaith Mr. *Br.* whom ſhall we beleeve? him that ſpeaketh from Heaven, or him that (at the beſt) ſpeaketh but from the earth? *But either ſo called* (ſaith Mr. *Br.*) *becauſe it expreſſeth the nature of the benefits of the New Covenant as they are offered on Gods part, without mentioning mans conditions* (*that being not pertinent to the buſineſs the Prophet had in hand.*) A moſt impudent fiction, yea it was the whole or chief thing he had in hand; was it not to ſhew the difference between theſe two under-covenants, that under the Law, and this under the Goſpel? but how doth it ſerve to this purpoſe to expreſſe the nature of the benefits of the New Covenant? Did not the Elect under the Law partake of the ſame benefits in nature though not in meaſure, with the Elect now? Or is not this one of the differences which he makes betwixt the Covenants, that the one was hedged about with hard conditions, the other free? *Or els,* ſaith he, *it ſpeaketh onely of what God will do for his Elect, in giving them the firſt Grace, and enabling them to perform the New Covenant.* Ridiculous; though right in the Monkes tone. For did not God give the firſt and ſecond Grace too, to the Elect under the Law as well as to the Elect under the Goſpel? Where then is the difference hence, to give a new name to the preſent Covenant? *But laſtly,* ſaith he, *It is a profeſſion and belongs to the will of purpoſe, not to his legiſlative will.* Now he hits the nail upon the head. He makes a very Aſſe of this diſtinction,

ction, and loads him with all ſorts of truth. It is to be doubted it will ſhortly get a gawld back, and kick his Maſter in the legg Predictions and Promiſes, becauſe they are not perteining to God legiſlative will, muſt henceforth give neither ſulture to our faith nor light to our judgments. The reſt that he hath upon this Th his hath nothing of moment in it calling for an anſwer.

Theſis 15.

B. p. 92. *Though Chriſt hath ſufficiently ſatisfied the Law, yet it is not his will, or the will of the Father, that any man ſhould be juſtified or ſaved thereby, who hath not ſome ground in himſelf of perſonall and particular claim thereto; Nor that any ſhould be juſtified by the blood, onely as ſhed or offered, except it be alſo received and applyed; ſo that no man by the meer ſatisfaction made is freed from the Law, or Curſe of the firſt violated Covenant abſolutely, but conditionally only.*

I annex this Poſition becauſe it is homogeneous with the many former, and though Mr. *Br.* would ſeem in the Explication to diſtinguiſh the matter of it from that which the former Aphoriſm conteined, yet is it not onely of the ſame kinde but of the ſame ſubſtance alſo with it, and what hath been ſaid in anſwer to that which went before might ſuffice as an anſwer to this alſo. Yet because it delights him to ſpeak the ſame things in a variation of words, let us ſee whether the words which he here uſeth have more efficacy in them to his purpoſe then the former.

We finde here as we did in ſome of the former Theſes, a ſtarch of ambiguities, and phraſes of a doubtfull ſenſe, which puts us into an uncapacity of anſwering his meaning, becauſe he ſo ſpeaketh that he will be ſure we ſhall not be able to prove what is his meaning.

Firſt when he ſaith, *It is not the will of Chriſt, or will of the Father*, he leaves us unreſolved whether he mean the will of purpoſe or the will of precept, that if we anſwer to the one, he may evade by a pretence he meant the other. If he will be underſtood of the former, when was he rapt up into the third Heaven to ſearch what ſecret purpoſes and decrees are hidden in the boſom of the Father or of the Son? Or if he hath it by revelation, why doth he not ſhew how and when it was given him, and whether in an ordinary or extraordinary manner? Or if he mean that will, how ſhall he take it up to be the rule of his judgment, which in the very [illegible] words to which I anſwered, and ſo often elſwhere, he abandoned from

from being the rule of other mens judgments? If he mean the latter, the will of precept, why holds he us ſuſpended in the expectation of alleaging the precept, and arguing forth his Concluſions hence, that if ſatisfactory we may ſubmit to it, if otherwiſe we may except againſt it?

Secondly when he tels us of Juſtification denying any living ſoul to have it only by Chriſts ſatisfaction, without ſome ground in himſelf of particular right and claim thereto, and except it be alſo received and applyed, *&c.* he leaves us doubtfull whether he meaneth Juſtification as compleated in Chriſt, or as evidenced alſo to our own conſciences. If the former what will he then conclude of periſhing or dying infants, that they are all unjuſtified, and in reſpect of the puniſhment of loſs remedileſly damned, and ſo with his brethren ſhut them up for ever in that dark priſon which is termed by them *Limbus infantum?* If the latter, and that he will give us leave to take his words in Scripture-ſenſe, we will not quarrel with them; but this in the Explication he ſeems to explode.

Thirdly when he tels us of ſome grounds of claim in our ſelves to Juſtification, which in the following words he ſeems to determinate to conſiſt in *our receiving and applying thereof*, and in the Explication, p. 93. he calls *ſomwhat of man intervening to give him a legall right to it*, annexing that we are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith; in all this he mixeth together falſhood and ſubtilty with his ambiguity: putting himſelf into that poſture wherein the Papiſts have painted and feigned *Eraſmus*, hovering between Heaven and Hell, ſometimes mounting on high, ſometimes ſinking low again, but pitching neither above, nor beneath. In ſuch a motion we here find Mr. *B.* as he is in his gradation further making out the Myſtery of Romiſh iniquity for a Law, ſoaring ſtill higher towards the very top of it, and ſinking lower from the Orb of Chriſtian verity? So by that ſomething of man that muſt enright him to Juſtification, he muſt mean ſomething more then Repentance and Faith, which he had before concluded neceſſary to Juſtification, *Theſ.* 14. Els were he upon a retreating not a marching poſture. Nevertheles how ſubtlely doth he dawb and paint to gull the ſimple, and catch them that are made to be taken, by putting fine words upon his courſe purpoſes, telling them that we are *juſtified by Faith*, and *that there is required on our part but receiving and applying of Chriſts merits*; as if he were as innocent as a Dove, and had none of the Serpent in him; when contrariwiſe the ſequele of his Tra-

ctate

ction, and loads him with all ſorts of truth. It is to be doubted it will ſhortly get a gawld back, and kick his Maſter in the legge Predictions and Promiſes, becauſe they are not perteining to God legiſlative will, muſt henceforth give neither ſulture to our faith nor light to our judgments. The reſt that he hath upon this Thes his hath nothing of moment in it calling for an anſwer.

Theſis 15.

B. p. 92. *Though Chriſt hath ſufficiently ſatisfied the Law, yet it is not his will, or the will of the Father, that any man ſhould be juſtified or ſaved thereby, who hath not ſome ground in himſelf of perſonall and particular claim thereto; Nor that any ſhould be juſtified by the blood, onely as ſhed or offered, except it be alſo received and applyed; ſo that no man by the meer ſatisfaction made is freed from the Law, or Curſe of the firſt violated Covenant abſolutely, but conditionally only.*

I annex this Poſition becauſe it is homogeneous with the many former, and though Mr. Br. would ſeem in the Explication to diſtinguiſh the matter of it from that which the former Aphoriſm conteined, yet is it not onely of the ſame kinde but of the ſame ſubſtance alſo with it, and what hath been ſaid in anſwer to that which went before might ſuffice as an anſwer to this alſo. Yet becauſe it delights him to ſpeak the ſame things in a variation of words, let us ſee whether the words which he here uſeth have more efficacy in them to his purpoſe then the former.

We finde here as we did in ſome of the former Theſes, a fardle of ambiguities, and phraſes of a doubtfull ſenſe, which puts us into an uncapacity of anſwering his meaning, becauſe he ſo ſpeaketh that he will be ſure we ſhall not be able to prove what is his meaning.

Firſt when he ſaith, *It is not the will of Chriſt, or will of the Father*, he leaves us unreſolved whether he mean the will of purpoſe or the will of precept, that if we anſwer to the one, he may evade by a pretence he meant the other. If he will be underſtood of the former, when was he rapt up into the third Heaven to ſearch what ſecret purpoſes and decrees are hidden in the boſom of the Father or of the Son? Or if he hath it by revelation, why doth he not ſhew how and when it was given him, and whether in an ordinary or extraordinary manner? Or if he mean that will, how ſhall he take it up to be the rule of his judgment, which in the very last words to which I anſwered, and ſo often elſwhere, he abandoned from

from being the rule of other mens judgments? If he mean the latter, the will of precept, why holds he us ſuſpended in the expectation of alleaging the precept, and arguing forth his Concluſions hence, that if ſatisfactory we may ſubmit to it, if otherwiſe we may except againſt it?

Secondly when he tels us of Juſtification denying any living ſoul to have it only by Chriſts ſatisfaction, without ſome ground in himſelf of particular right and claim thereto, and except it be alſo received and applyed, *&c.* he leaves us doubtfull whether he meaneth Juſtification as compleated in Chriſt, or as evidenced alſo to our own conſciences. If the former what will he then conclude of periſhing or dying infants, that they are all unjuſtified, and in reſpect of the puniſhment of loſs remedileſly damned, and ſo with his brethren ſhut them up for ever in that dark priſon which is termed by them *Limbus infantum?* If the latter, and that he will give us leave to take his words in Scripture-ſenſe, we will not quarrel with them; but this in the Explication he ſeems to explode.

Thirdly when he tels us of ſome grounds of claim in our ſelves to Juſtification, which in the following words he ſeems to determinate to conſiſt in *our receiving and applying thereof*, and in the Explication, *p.* 93. he calls *ſomwhat of man intervening to give him a legall right to it*, annexing that we are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith; in all this he mixeth together falſhood and ſubtilty with his ambiguity: putting himſelf into that poſture wherein the Papiſts have painted and feigned *Eraſmus*, hovering between Heaven and Hell, ſometimes mounting on high, ſometimes ſinking low again, but pitching neither above, nor beneath. In ſuch a motion we here find Mr. *B.* as he is in his gradation further making out the Myſtery of Romiſh iniquity for a Law, ſoaring ſtill higher towards the very top of it, and ſinking lower from the Orb of Chriſtian verity? So by that ſomething of man that muſt enright him to Juſtification, he muſt mean ſomething more then Repentance and Faith, which he had before concluded neceſſary to Juſtification, *Theſ.* 14. Els were he upon a retreating not a marching poſture. Nevertheles how ſubtlely doth he dawb and paint to gull the ſimple, and catch them that are made to be taken, by putting fine words upon his courſe purpoſes, telling them that we are *juſtified by Faith*, and *that there is required on our part but receiving and applying of Chriſts merits*; as if he were as innocent as a Dove, and had none of the Serpent in him; when contrariwiſe the ſequele of his Tra-

ctate

ſtate proclaimes him, by that which he calls here ſomewhat of man, to mean at the full with the worſt Papiſts, mans works to the totall excluſion of Gods grace. In mean while his words leave it doubtfull here what this ſomewhat of man is, and whether it be the hand or the heel that muſt receive and apply Chriſt to Juſtification? His Diſciples are not yet enough moulded (he thinks) to receive the Dragons voice in his own tone; they muſt be accuſtomed to bear the Calf daily untill he become an Oxe that he may be born then too, and at length we ſhall finde the inſtrument which Mr. *B.* appoints to receive Chriſt, to be inſtrumentall onely to puſh him from us. However he concludes thus (becauſe he will have it ſo) *That no man by the meer ſatisfaction made, is freed from the Law and Curſe*, &c. *abſolutely, but conditionally onely*, i. e. not at all. And this he hath ſaid over and over already, and there needs no further Anſwer then that which hath been before given: So that where he repeats this Aſſertion again in the Explication, *That Chriſt doth not juſtifie by the ſhedding of his blood immediately, without ſomwhat of man intervening*, &c. adding that *All the Scriptures alleged p. 79. do prove it.* I grant what he ſaith, for I finde no Scripture there alleaged. But if he mean p. 89, & 90. what I ſaid there I ſay here again, he ſhall not miſſe of an anſwer to them when he comes to alleage them again in their proper place, and declare how he will argue from them. Yet becauſe the man is delighted to deliver firſt in generall what he will after deliver again in particulars, I ſhall ſay ſomething alſo in generall to his generall aſſertion, That Chriſts ſatisfaction juſtifieth not without *ſomething of man intervening to give him right to it.* Let us ſee what the Scripture ſaith for or againſt it.

The Apoſtle ſpeaking of mans redemption and juſtification, and ſhewing the cauſe why ſome have, and ſome have not their part in it, affirmeth and proveth, that *it is not of him that willeth or of him that runneth, but of God that ſheweth mercy*, Rom. 9. 16. By the willing, is to be underſtood all the good qualifications and operations of the ſoul; by running all the good works of a mans life and practice, as all confeſs. When the Holy Ghoſt excludeth every ſomewhat of man within the man, and every ſomewhat of man without man, from conferring any thing to Juſtification, what other ſomewhat remaineth of man to intervene, &c? Let it be judged whether Mr. B. doth not purpoſely fight againſt Scripture?

Again,

Again, *Rom.* 5. 6, 8, 9, 10. *When we were yet without ſtrength,* (viz. to any ſpirituall operation) *Chriſt dyed for the ungodly, while we were yet ſinners Chriſt dyed for us, and we were juſtified by his bloud: while enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.* Here the Reſult of the Apoſtles reaſoning diſcovers to us two things to our purpoſe. 1 That according to the minde and language of the Holy Ghoſt *Chriſt dying*, and by his death *ſatisfying* for any mans ſinns, and that mans *juſtification, and reconciliation to God* by that ſatisfaction, are equipollent terms, holding forth one and the ſame thing. For ſo the Apoſtle here uſeth juſtification and reconciliation as words of the ſame ſenſe and weight. And *Ameſius* manifeſteth in what reſpects they muſt needs be taken for the ſame thing, and makes both the ſame with Chriſts dying for him. So that every perſon for whom Chriſt hath by his death made ſatisfaction, is effectually juſtified and reconciled to God (I mean) in Chriſt, though poſſibly not yet in his own apprehenſion. 2 That we are thus juſtified and reconciled to God, while ungodly, while ſinners, while enemies, while without ſtrength to that which is good. What *ſomewhat of man* can there be in ſuch, to enright them to juſtification, unleſs any will ſay, their impotency, ungodlines, ſin and enmity ſhall do it? Such contrariety is there between Mr. *Br* and the Spirit or word of truth. There needs not much deliberation to determine which to follow. But he proceeds,

Ames Med. Lib. 1. c. 27. Sect. 22.

Bax. p. 93. *Let all the Antinomians ſhew but one Scripture which ſpeaks of Juſtification from Eternity.*

And what if it be but one of all, or one that is not an Antinomian that ſhews it, will Mr. *Br* harken and ſubmit his judgement to that Scripture ſo alleaged? I ſay in like manner: Let all the Antichriſtian Jeſuite, or Mr. *Br.* or his Mr *Grotius*, ſhew one Scripture which aſſerteth onely a conditionall and not an abſolute Juſtification purchaſed to us by Chriſt, I will hear and ſubmit, though I ſee not then how to be ſaved. As to his Challenge I ſhall ſpeak in a more proper place.

Bax. *I know God hath decreed to juſtifie his people from eternity, and ſo he hath to ſanctifie them too, but both of them are done in time: Juſtification being no more an immanent act in God, than ſanctification: as I ſhall ſhew afterward.*

I ſhall therefore wait on him untill he hath the leiſure and pleaſure to ſhew it. In the mean while, why doth he Conclude ſo hotly and peremptorily before-hand that which he brings nothing ſave

his own bare affirmation to prove. He ſaid not unwiſely which ſaid; *Let not him that girdeth on his armour boaſt as he that putteth it off.* 1 *King.* 20. 11.

Bax. *The bloud of Chriſt then is ſufficient* in ſuo genere, *but not in* omni genere; *ſufficient for its own work, but not for every work. There are ſeverall other neceſſaries to Juſtifie and ſave,* quibus poſitis, *which being ſuppoſed, the bloud of Chriſt will be effectuall.*

Qui non vult intelligi debet negligi. He that will ſo ſpeak that he may not be underſtood, is worthy to paſs without an Anſwer. If he mean that the bloud of Chriſt is ſufficient to compleat our juſtification before God, and that this is its own work; But that there are other neceſſaries to juſtifie us in our ſelves and our own apprehenſions, which being ſuppoſed the work is ended; I will abſtein from all contradiction. If he mean otherwiſe, and will not expreſs himſelf. *Hony ſoit Qui male penſe.*

Bax. *p.* 94. *Not that it receives its efficacy from theſe, nor that theſe do add any thing at all to its worth and value, no more than the cabbinett to the jewell, or the applying hand to the Medicine, or the offenders acceptation to the pardon of his Prince. Yet without this acceptation and application, this bloud will not be effectuall to juſtifie us.*

Theſe words would ſeem to plead a good meaning in Mr. *Bax.* to them that neither are acquainted with the glozings of the Papiſts, nor with that which followeth in this Treatiſe of Mr. *Bax.* He might be thought by this his ſmoothing to attribute our Juſtification wholly to Chriſts ſufferings, and nothing to any thing in our ſelves, ſave to faith only, nor to Faith, but as it is appointed of God to be inſtrumentall for the accepting and receiving into our boſom Chriſts merits and the benefits thereof. The like fine words we ſhall finde oft falling from the pen of *Pelagius*, Papiſts, Arminians, &c. But both of him and them I may ſay what the Lord once ſaid of *Iſrael*; *This people hath well ſpoken in all that they have ſaid: O that there were in them ſuch a heart &c.* Deut. 5. 28, 29.

He proceeds and oppoſeth to the Authority of our Apoſtle *Paul*, the authority of his St *Grotius*, at the hearing of whoſe ſophiſticall learning, all the doctrine of *Paul* muſt fall broken and ſhivered to the earth, no leſſe than the Ark of God did before the great *Dagon* of the *Philiſtims*.

Bax.

Bax. *Cum unuſquiſq; actui ex ſua voluntate pendenti legem poſſit imponere &c.* as may be there read at large. *p.* 94.

The ſumme of all is this. Becauſe our juſtification is an act proceeding from the meer and free will of God and of Chriſt, it was therefore in their power, after payment made by Chriſt, and accepted by the Father in our behalf, to covenant, and accompliſh our diſcharge, either forthwith or a long time after, either ſimply or upon Conditions. Therefore it is Covenanted between the Father and the Son that we ſhall be, after ſatisfaction made, not forthwith, but in proceſſe of time, juſtified, and then alſo not purely or abſolutely but conditionally. A mad Argumentation. For *A poſſe ad eſſe non valet Conſequentia.* It is as if I ſhould argue God could have ſupported Mr. *Br* and his Mr *Grotius* in the truth of the Goſpel. *Ergo* he hath preſerved them in the truth. What judicious man that hath conſiderately read their works, would not hiſſe at ſuch an argument? But he adds the authority of *Auſtin.*

Bax. *As Auſtin. He that made us without us, will not ſave us without us.*

O that Mr. *Br* had ſtood as *Auſtin*, pillar-like to beare up the Grace of God entire in the whole buſines of our ſalvation, againſt all the ſophiſms of *Pelagius* and his followers. We ſhould in no wiſe have excepted, againſt *Auguſtines* words in Mr. *Baxters* mouth uttering them in *Auguſtines* ſenſe. We make not men ſtocks and ſtones, nor deny the operation of their wills moved by Gods Spirit in the way to happines.

Yet the ſentence it ſelf alleaged out of *Auſtin*, (I doubt) is perverted by Mr. *Baxter*, as it hath been by ſome before him. I have been told that in *Auſtin* it is read intorrogatively; and bears the force of an affirmative, thus; *He that made thee without thee, will he not ſave thee without thee?* which is equivolent to this (if it were ſaid) *he will ſave thee without thee.* For the truth of it I have been directed to his Serm. 11. *de verb. Apoſtoli.* where though I finde it not *totidem verbis*, yet the full ſenſe and ſubſtance thereof I finde. The Father treating of thoſe words of the Pſalmiſt [*He made us without us, or not we our ſelves*] improves them by the annexion of other Scriptures againſt *Pelagius*, demonſtrating that he alſo ſaves us when we were loſt without us. To this effect his ſentences are full and manifold. *Perditos nos per nos, reficit nos qui fecit nos.* Again, *Ipſe fecit nos & non ipſi nos, ut ſimus populus ejus & oves paſcuæ ejus.* Again, *Homines ſumus ipſe fecit nos, fideles ſumus & jam juſti, ipſe fecit nos & non ipſi nos.* Again,

gain, *Ipſe fecit nos, & antequàm eſſemus omninò ipſe fecit nos: & factos & lapſos ipſe juſtos fecit nos, & non ipſi nos. Nondum erat* [*homo*] *& factus eſt: offendit & ſalvus factus.* Again, *Quis prior dedit ei & retribuetur ei? Si Dominus retribuere vellet, nihil niſi pœnam debitam retribuiſſet. Nihil dederunt ut eis, retribueretur, pro nihilo ſalvos fecit illos.* In a word, as all this is directly againſt Mr. *Baxter*, ſo is there no one title in the whole Sermon for him, but all proving not in Mr. *Baxters* ſophiſticall way, but ſeriouſly and profoundly from cleer and invincible Scriptures, our ſalvation to be onely Gods work, not his and ours together. If nothing elſe ſhould be ſaid, that which *Auſtin* in this one Chapter hath ſaid, is enough to bury Mr. *Baxters* doctrine in the dirt for ever.

Bax. *He never maketh a relative change, where he doth not alſo make a reall.*

True, but whether the relative, or the reall change hath the precedency in order, is the queſtion. Whether our reconciliation or juſtification go before ſanctification, or follow it as the fruit thereof.

Bax. *Gods decree gives no man a legal title to the benefit decreed him, ſeeing purpoſe and promiſe are ſo different.*

True, but altogether beſides the queſtion.

Bax. *A legall title we muſt have before we can be juſtified; and there muſt be ſomewhat in our ſelves to prove that title, or elſe all men ſhould have equall right.*

If he ſpeak of our being juſtified in our ſelves, or having our Juſtification evidenced to our ſelves, or our brethren, we conſent with him. If he mean otherwiſe (in the ſenſe often mentioned) what he ſaith here is that which he hath often ſaid, but it remaineth yet to be proved. There is ſomewhat elſe (as hath been oft ſhewed) beſides Mr. *Brs* ſomewhat in us, that differenceth man from man, that all have not equall right. And this is ſomewhat in Chriſt, not ſomewhat in us.

CHAP. XIII.

Mr. Baxters *doctrine of a twofold*, i.e. *a legal and Evangelical Righteouſnes equally neceſſary to ſalvation, or Juſtification, examined. The terms and phraſe which he uſeth diſcuſſed: and how little he ſaith to prove either phraſe or matter to be good, manifeſted.*

I Shall totally pretermit the 16th Aphoriſme and its explication, not but that there are ſome paſſages therein deſerving examination, but becauſe that what is delivered in ſuch paſſages, is done very warily, and may admit of a good as well as of a bad Conſtruction; and in the following part of his book, Mr. *Br* ſpeaketh it out fully and plainly, that no man can doubt of his meaning; Therefore is more properly to be anſwered there, than in this place.

Neither ſhall I ſay much to the 17, & 18 Aphoriſms, becauſe they are but (as it were) a bridge of Mr. *Brs* making, on which to paſs over to the following matter. Yet that he may not Complain of wrong, that he is deprived of the honour of his artificiall Methode, I ſhall tranſcribe his words, and annex ſome animadverſions upon them.

Theſis 17.

Bax. p. 102. *Therefore as there are two Covenants with their diſtinct conditions: So is there a twofold Righteouſnes, and both of them abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation.*

Theſis 18. pag. 103.

Our Legal Righteouſnes or Righteouſnes of the firſt Covenant is not perſonall, or conſiſteth not in any qualifications of our own perſons, or actions performed by us, (for we never fulfilled, nor perſonally ſatisfied the Law:) but it is wholly without us in Chriſt. And in this ſenſe it is that the Apoſtle (and every Chriſtian) diſclaimeth his own Righteouſnes, or his own works, as being no true legal Righteouſnes, Phil. 3. 7, 8.

Theſis 19. p. 107.

The Righteouſnes of the New Covenant is the onely Condition of or intereſt in and enjoyment of the Righteouſnes of the old. Or thus: Thoſe onely ſhall have part in Chriſts ſatisfaction, and ſo in him be legally Righteous, who beleeve, and obey the Goſpel, and ſo are in themſelves Evangelically Righteous.

Theſis

Theſis 20. p. 108.

Our Evangelicall Righteouſnes is not without us in Chriſt, a our legall Righteouſneſs is; but conſiſteth in our own Actions of faith and Goſpel obedience. Or thus: Though Chriſt perform the conditions of the Law, and ſatisfieth for our non-performance; yet it is our ſelves that muſt perform the Conditions of the Goſpel.

I cloſe up all theſe poſitions together (as it were) in one Frontiſpice, partly in regard of their neer Cognation in Nature, and partly that the profoundnes and dexterity of Mr. *Br* may the more cleerly appear: and that it may be here evidenced to the very ſenſes of all, what is ſaid *Gen.* 3. 1. *That the Serpent is more ſubtle than all the beaſts of the field which God hath made.*

The one part of Mr. *Brs* Goſpel we have found, in the former part of this Tractate, the ſumme and ſubſtance whereof may be thus expreſſed; That Chriſt Jeſus by the will of his Father, hath by the ſatisfaction made to juſtice for the ſins of the Elect, obteined that the whole Curſe and managing thereof, together with the Elect for whom he hath ſatisfied, ſhould be delivered up into his hand: And he ſheweth himſelf in this his power an *unmercifull High Prieſt*, holding his redeemed ones, under the Curſe, wrath, and torment in ſoul and body, not giving them deliverance untill the day of judgement. He did ſomewhat before look unto, but now really enters upon the ſecond part, which is like to the former, holding forth a juſtification in the world to come, upon ſuch Conditions as will not bring any unto, but certainly exclude all, that to this end uſe and perform them, from juſtification into condemnation. Within the Confines of theſe two eſſentiall parts of his Goſpel, he comprizeth all the riches of grace by Chriſt, which whoſoever likes it, may if he will, partake of. Such have we already found the Nature of the firſt part of his Goſpel. We are now to examine whether the ſecond part thereof be not ſuch as I have here mentioned; if not, I have wronged Mr. *Br*; if ſo, he wrongs Chriſt, and works againſt him ſeeking the damnation of the Elect. And by the very words of theſe four propoſitions of his, (if nothing els were to be added) he that is both orthodox and judicious, may ſomewhat judge whither Mr. *Br* driveth, finding him to ſet up mans righteouſnes paralell with Chriſts righteouſnes, and equally neceſſary to our Juſtification; ſo making man at leaſt a demiſaviour to himſelf, and ſo (in effect prove) an abſolute deſtroyer of his own ſoul. For whoſoever

ſoever brings any thing beſides Chriſt to his juſtification, falls utterly from Chriſt, righteouſnes, and ſalvation.

Yet while he thus acts the part of one of thoſe *evill workers* mentioned *Phil.* 3. 2. he ſhews himſelf an Artizan to deceive the wits of the time, no leſs than *Muncer* did himſelf to beguile the witles Common people in *Germany*. He when he was vanquiſhed, taken, and now under the hands of the tormentor, being demanded why he had ſo deluded the ſilly vulgar multitude to his own and their ruine; breaking forth into a vehement laughter, anſwered, *Sic voluerunt*, They would have it ſo; inſinuating that becauſe he found them little regarding the ſolidity and power of the Goſpel, but itching after novelties, he attempered and even ſacrified his ſtudies to their humour, untill he had ſubverted himſelf and them. So Mr. Br taking notice of ſome affected wits that had rather periſh and dye for ever by Art, & that which is falſely called *Science* or learning, 1 *Tim.* 6. 20. than to live and be ſaved by the ſimplicity and plainnes of the Goſpel; compoſeth himſelf wholly to pleaſe their humour, and make himſelf their darling; handles the Caſe ſo finely and artificially, that he may kill them ſoftly, they never feeling it untill they are dead and ruined for ever.

One peece of his artifice we have here in his invention of that twofold Righteouſnes of the two Covenants abſolutely neceſſary to juſtification or ſalvation: The one in Chriſt, the other in our ſelves: Chriſts righteouſnes purchaſing for us a conditionall juſtification, a poſſibility of righteouſnes & bliſs in the world to come; but the other, our righteouſnes when once finiſhed and compleated, being that which doth the deed and drives the nail to the head, making both Chriſts righteouſneſs and the juſtification purchaſed by it, to be no longer Conditionally, but actually and really ours. Provided and alwayes excepted that this cannot be in this life, and ſo the tryall of Mr. *Brs* doctrine by experience, can never be made untill this world be wholly ended.

This is learning indeed, ſuch as neither the dictates of men, (at leaſt *totidem verbis*, in ſo fine a contexture of words) nor the Oracles of God could ever teach Mr. *Br.* It is his own and poſſibly may continue his onely to the worlds end, all men els proving themſelves too wiſe or too fooliſh to joyn with him in this his ſpeculation. We thought that the righteouſneſs according to the Covenant under which God hath placed us, had ſufficed to juſtification; he tells us nay, but we are under both the Covenant of works and

the

the Covenant of grace too, and must be righteous in the righteousnes of both. The world had not the wit untill now, nor yet Christ, or any of his Prophets or Apostles had it ever in their Consideration to term Christ our legall, and our own works and qualifications our Gospel righteousnes: Mr. *Br* first having received it rough hewen from Papists and Arminians, teacheth us this piece of distinctionary learning. Neither did it enter ever into our thoughts that the righteousnes of the Old Covenant was of a more noble race, or that the righteousnes which is in our selves could be more excellent than that which Christ is made to us, untill this new Doctor took the Chair to teach Mysteries, and by inverting and misnaming Scripture-phrase hath so taught.

Nevertheles it behoved Mr. *Br* having resolved to keep on the triple Crown upon the Popes head, by stablishing justification upon works, (though it were to the uncrowning of Christ,) to reject uprightnes and to seek after inventions, *Eccles.* 7. 29. First he must hold beleevers to be under both Covenants, els while he builds up one peece of Babylon, he should pluck down another; and give his judgment against his holines in one point, while he acts the Champion for him in another: and adventure with all the lots of his Cause, if he keep not as strong hold-fast in the Covenant of works with the one hand, as in the Covenant of grace with the other. 2 He must call the Condition or means of applying Christ to us or obteining interest in his satisfaction, our Righteousnes, els he will not be able to evade those Scriptures which assert our Justification by faith. But by this feat he thinks himself in a fit posture both to answer this, and to bring in all qualifications and works that he pleaseth in a partnership with faith to justifie. True (will he say) we are justified by Faith as a part of our righteousnes, and by all other good qualifications and works as other parts of our righteousnes. 3 He must call faith and works our Evangelicall righteousnes, having seen in what a stinking trance some of his dirty deer brethren in their disputes have been left, when they would prove that good works as works of the Law do justifie: and how little better they have fared, who would have them to justifie only as works of grace, having not had enough subtlety to prove them Gospel or Grace works. Need had he therefore to put himself upon strong and strange inventions that himself may not stick in the same mire after them. But enough in generall, let us hear him deliver his own minde in particulars.

B. *Thes.*

B. *Theſ.* 17. *p.* 102. *As there are two Covenants with their diſtinct Conditions: So is there a twofold Righteouſnes, and both of them abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation.*

The latter member of this propoſition is grounded upon the former, the *Theſis* upon the *Hypotheſis*. As true is the latter as the former. But how true is the former, that there are two Covenants, and that they have their diſtinct Conditions? Firſt when he ſaith there are two Covenants, he meaneth two Covenants in force to the very Saints in Chriſt, that while they are under grace to ſalvation, they are alſo under the Law to the Curſe and Condemnation. This hath been his buſines to Confirm in the former part of this Treatiſe, and he owns it in the explication of this *Theſis*. But this is falſe as in diſapproving of his arguments before hath been proved. *They are no more under the Law, who are once under grace*, Rom. 6. 14. 2ly, Neither have the two Covenants their diſtinct Conditions, according to Mr. *Br*. For *Theſ.* 4. he makes the Condition of the firſt Covenant, *Perfect Obedience* or *Righteouſnes*. The ſame he makes here the Condition of the New Covenant, *viz. Faith and Obedience*, but both as integrant parts of our own inherent righteouſnes; as we have partly ſeen, and ſhall be forced to ſee more fully in that which is to come after. So that we grant him that as true, as there are two Covenants, with their diſtinct Conditions in force to the ſame perſons, ſo true is it that there is a twofold Righteouſneſs, and both abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, (if by ſalvation he means Juſtification) *At falſum prius, ergo & poſterius*. When he brings proofs to Confirm his aſſertions, he may meet with a larger anſwer. In mean while a ſimple Negation ſtands fitteſt in oppoſition to his bare affirmation.

That which he brings in the explication to Confirm it hath been anſwered over and over before. Onely he tells us in the upſhot that *He will take it as granted:* To which I anſwer, that there hath been ſuch a generation of men ſtill upon earth ſo fingerative, that will needs take that which was never granted and delivered to them; ſuch is the main bulk of Mr. *Brs* doctrine in this book taken but never delivered to him from God or his Chriſt.

Bax. *The uſuall confounding of theſe Righteouſneſſes* (ſaith he) *doth much darken the Controverſies about Juſtification.*

And Mr. Br doth no leſs cleer the Controverſie, than an Eccliſe the Sun-beams.

He proceeds to explain what this twofold *Righteouſnes* is, ſo abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation.

Bax. *The legall Righteouſneſs* (ſaith he) *is not in us, or conſiſteth not in any qualifications of our own perſons, or actions performed by us, But it is wholly without us in Chriſt*, Theſ. 18. p. 103.

The righteouſnes of the New Covenant is the onely Condition of our intereſt in and enjoyment of the Righteouſnes of the old, &c. Theſ. 19. p. 107.

Our Evangelicall Righteouſnes is not without us in Chriſt, as our Legall Righteouſnes is, but conſiſteth in our own actions of Faith and Goſpel Obedience &c. Theſ. 20. p. 108.

What there is more in any of theſe three poſitions, is tranſcribed at large before. To the 18 *Theſis* he annexeth in the explication a diſpute againſt the Papiſts, not to Confute them as adverſaries to the truth, for joyning mans righteouſnes with Chriſts righteouſneſs unto juſtification, (for herein he profeſſeth entire Communion with them) but to admoniſh them as his loving brethren to defend this their Concluſion of Juſtification by their own righteouſneſs, not under the terms of their legall, but of their Evangelicall righteouſneſs. Becauſe the legall righteouſnes is unpoſſible, but the Evangelicall righteouſnes (according to his carving and forming of it) is eaſie to be fullfilled, and almoſt unpoſſible to be violated. Not that the Papiſts were wholly ignorant of this myſtery untill Mr. *Br* here teacheth them. Nay many of them had and pleaded it very artificially, before he was born. And himſelf hath learned it of them: But he as the moſt proficient of all their diſciples hath more fully improved it, ſo that now he becomes a teacher to his very Maſters, and exhorts them to learn of him the pious feat and fraud, of making uſe of this diſtinction yet further than ever they had the wit or grace to deviſe; even to all matters and purpoſes that tend to the eluding of the word of Chriſt, and the advantaging of the holy mother Church, in her doctrine of Juſtification, that is altogether Contradictory to the doctrine of the Scriptures upon the ſame Argument.

To the 19th & 20th poſitions he annexeth an explication of both of theſe and of all that was ſaid in the two former poſitions alſo. In it we ſhall finde whatſoever deſerveth a fuller Anſwer than hath been yet given to all and every of theſe four poſitions, or any thing in all or any of them conteined, not againſt but according to his own expreſſed and explicated meaning.

Bax.

Bax. p. 108. Explication. *The Contents of theſe Poſitions being of ſo neer nature, I ſhall explain them here together, though they ſeem ſo plain and clear to me, that they need not much explication, and leſs confirmation: Yet becauſe ſome Antinomians do down-right oppoſe them, and ſome that are no Antinomians have ſtartled at the expreſſions, as if they had conteined ſome ſelf exalting horrid doctrine, I ſhall ſay ſomething hereto. Though for my part I do ſo much wonder that any able Divines ſhould deny them: yet me thinks they ſhould be Articles of our Creed, and a part of Childrens Catechiſms, and underſtood and beleeved by every man that is a Chriſtian: I mean the matter of them, if not the phraſe; though I think it to be agreeable to the matter alſo.*

Egregious Confidence and a ſparkiſh ſpirit! If the Triumphant Chariot were in uſe again at *Rome*, and that Mr. *Br* could either not get it, or not hold it, he would at leaſt give occaſion to the world to Epitaph upon him, ——*Magnis tamen excidit Auſis*, he hath bidden fair and ſtretched wide for it. Yet there would be ſome men that would otherwiſe Comment upon his bravery of words. That they are uſually bad wares that will not go off without ſuch bravery of words. That Bragg is ſeldom the beſt Souldier. That thundering words are moſtly uſed, when there is wanting ſtrength of reaſon to ſupport a Cauſe. We ſhall in ſome meaſure be able to judge when we have examined, what ſound Arguments Mr. *Br* brings to Confirm his aſſertions. By the way we are to note his ſubtlety, his ingenuity, and his gallantry. 1 His ſubtlety in pretending that his Aſſertions are mainly oppoſed by Antinomians; and that all that he delivers here, is out of his pure zeal (good man) to daſh thoſe earth-born monſters that they may do no more harm. Doth Mr. *Br* think that none but ſtrangers in our *Iſrael*, none but novices in divinity, that never ſaluted the Goſpel, but at twelve furlongs diſtance, none that ever had acquaintance with this Controverſie between the Papiſts and us, ſhould read his book, that he thinks to blinde the eyes of all with ſuch a mummery? Nay let him name one man in any of the reformed Churches, that hath been numbred among the Orthodox, which diſſenteth not in the Chaffy doctrine here delivered from him? Or any ſave the worſt, or a man worſe than the worſt Papiſts, that conſenteth with him to make our inherent righteouſnes the Condition to give us right to Chriſts imputed righteouſneſs? Muſt Chriſt and *Paul*, and all Evangelicall diſciples be rejected as Antinomians, becauſe they be-

came not Mr. *Baxters* disciples, and that before he became their Teacher? Or how could they downright oppose this doctrine, before he vented it in print? Was he so familiar with them as to Communicate to them his Manuscripts? Or hath any other since the world began delivered the same assertions in the same words, that in opposing them Mr. *Br* should take himself opposed? But he suspends his subtlety a little to shew some though but little ingenuity, which is the second thing here Considerable in him: Confessing that there are some that are no Antinomians who have started at the expressions, as if they had conteined some self-exalting horrid doctrine. And did not this also startle Mr. *Br* to reexamine what he had written before he Committed it to the Presse? Nothing less, but he looks over them with a fastidious admiration, that they should be so shallow, himself being so profound, rejecting their authority, with the like Contempt that *Cæsar* did *Syllaes*, Tush he was a *duus Non potuit dictare*, so he of these, *Nequeunt Philosophari.* And thus in the third place passeth on to his gallantry or rather his arrogance. That his doctrines here are so plain and clear, that they need little explication, less Confirmation, That he wonders any able Divines should deny them: shall such be termed Divines? nay his very *Catechumeni*, the Children under his Catechising, much more every man that is a Christian should understand and believe them. That they should be taken up for our Creed, why? because profound Mr. *Br* hath delivered them; if not upon this ground, let him name that man upon earth that hath delivered or believed them before himself became the author of them. But at length he somewhat stoopeth from his bravery, and tells us that he would have the matter of them at least thus taken into the Canon of our faith and Creed, if not the phrase: though he think it to be agreeable to the matter also: and therefore goeth about thus to defend his phrase and make it good.

Bax. *p.* 109. *That there may be no contention about words, you must take my phrase of (legall and Evangelicall Righteousnes) in the sense before explained: viz. as they take their name from the Covenant which is their rule. And I know not how any Righteousnes should be called (Legall or Evangelicall) in a sense more strict and proper, nor whence the denomination can be better taken, than from the formall Reason of the thing: yet I know that the observance of the Law of Ceremonies, and the seeking life by the works of the Law, are both commonly called legall Righteousnes:*

ness: but in a very improper sense in comparison of this. I know also, that Christs legall Righteousnes imputed to us, is commonly called [*Evangelicall Righteousnes.*] *But that is from a more alien, extrinsecall Respect; viz. because the Gospel declareth and offereth this Righteousness, and because it is a way to justification which onely the Gospel revealeth. I do not quarrell with any of these forms of speech, onely explain my own, which I know not how to express more properly, that I may not be misunderstood. The righteousnes of the New Covenant then being the performance of its Conditions, and its Conditions being our obeying of the Gospel, or beleeving, it must be plain, that on no other terms we do partake of the legall Righteousnes of Christ. To hold therefore that our Evangelicall or New Covenant Righteousness is in Christ, and not in our selves, or performed by Christ, and not by our selves, is such a monstrous peece of Antinomian Doctrine, that no man who knowes the Nature and difference of the Covenants, can possibly entertain, and that which every Christian should abhorr as unsufferable.*

Here we finde Mr. *Br* at the very t p of his gallantry and animosity; most probably his fancy had suggested to him a totall rout of all terrene animals at the sound of his precedent glorying, and polemicall argumentation; as if therefore all this visible world were Conquered, and he were marching out of it in triumph, as *Israel* out of *Egypt*, not a dogg being left to move his tongue against him: he now challengeth the Heavens, and Calls the Holy Ghost *ad partes*, to Come to a reckoning for the impropriety of language which he useth by his penmen in the Scriptures. For when he saith, *I know that the observance of the Law of Ceremonies, and the seeking of Life by the works of the Law, are both commonly called Legall Righteousnes, and that Christs legall righteousnes imputed to us is commonly called Evangelicall Righteousnes:* he must needs mean primarily that these are so Called Commonly in holy Scriptures, and but secondarily that they are so called by Ecclesiasticall Writers, as they derive from the Scriptures a Chaste Scripture phrase wherein to expresse spirituall doctrines, For so the Scripture mentioneth onely two kinds of *Righteousnes* that ever Came or shall Come into Competition about our Justification, the one a legall righteousnes, or righteousnes of the Law, the other the Evangelicall righteousnes, or righteousnes of the Gospel. The legall Righteousnes it *affirms to be a righteousnes of works which we have done*, i. e. of good qualifications within us, and good operations flowing from us; the

the Evangelicall righteouſneſs to be *of meer grace and mercy*, Tit. 3. 5. The latter it terms *Gods Righteouſneſs*, i. e. that which God giveth and imputeth; the former *our own righteouſneſs*, i. e. which is wrought within our ſelves, and acted by our ſelves, *Rom.* 10. 3. *Phil.* 3. 9. That of the Law, *a Righteouſnes of works*, this of the Goſpel, *a Righteouſneſs without works*, Rom. 4. 6. That a *Righteouſneſs in our ſelves, inherent*, This *a Righteouſneſs in Chriſt, imputed*, Eph. 2. 8. 2 Cor. 5. 21. Or let Mr. Br ſhew any one Scripture that terms the Righteouſneſs which is in and by Chriſt a legall, or that which is inherent in our ſelves an Evangelicall Righteouſneſs: or that terms any gift or qualification in man, or work and deed of man his righteouſneſs, any peece of his righteouſneſs unto Juſtification. So that his quarrell here is againſt the Holy Ghoſt for ſpeaking ſo improperly and incongruouſly in Scriptures, and Calling the Righteouſneſs which is by Chriſt Evangelicall, and the righteouſneſs which is in our ſelves Legall Righteouſneſs. But how will he Confute the Holy Ghoſt, and prove an abſurdity and impropriety in the language of the Holy Ghoſt? Forſooth, by oppoſing himſelf, his own authority and learning, to the Holy Ghoſt, and his wiſdome and authority. Himſelf he affirms to ſpeak logically, and by Conſequence, *ſtrictly and properly*, But the Holy Ghoſt is no ſcholar, never read *Ariſtotle*, therefore ſpeaks rudely, ruſtically, like one of the Rural Animals, not as an Artiſt out of the ſchools. Himſelf gives (ſcholar-like) *a denomination to theſe two Righteouſneſſes, from the Covenant which is their Rule, from the Formall Reaſon of the thing*: But the Holy Ghoſt for lack of ſchool-learning, gives names thereunto from more *Alien Extrinſecall reſpects*. This is the ſumme of his reaſoning. And is it not poſſible to requeſt from Mr. Br that he would take the Holy Ghoſt a while as a pupill into his Tuition, to read unto him ſome Logicall Lectures by which he may be inſtructed to mould a new the Scriptures into another, a Logical, inſteed of that ſpirituall and Celeſtiall phraſe in which we now finde them? Or if the Spirit of truth and wiſdom ſhould be the Teacher, not the Schollar of Mr. Br, then may we break out into Mr. *Brs* words againſt Mr. Br, *Monſtrous Doctrine*, pride, reaſoning, *and that which every Chriſtian ſhould abhorr as unſufferable*.

But if Mr. Br be not in more haſte than good ſpeed, a word or two, we ſhall requeſt from him to be reſolved in ſome few queſtions, (before we part,) upon that which he hath here written.

Firſt, Whether it hath not been the Common ſlight of all ſubtle here-

eretikes to make new and unuſed phraſes their harbingers to pro-
ote and make way for the vending of their new opinions and
onſtrous doctrines? yea whether he himſelf had not firſt laid
own a purpoſe within himſelf of broaching his doctrine of Juſti-
cation by works and inherent righteouſneſs, and then after devi-
d this new diſtinction of our legall righteouſnes in Chriſt, and
vangelicall righteouſneſs in our ſelves, both neceſſary to our ju-
ification? or to what other end hath he coined this novelty of
ords and phraſe in oppoſition to the language of the Goſpel, but
o make it ſubſervient to the novelty of his pernicious doctrine,
ontrary to the doctrine of the Goſpel?

2 Whether by this novelty of phraſe he doth not attribute more
xcellency and efficacy (as to juſtification) to mans inherent, than
o Chriſts imputed righteouſneſs? For *pag.* 98. himſelf affirmeth,
hat *The primary moſt excellent and moſt proper righteouſneſs lyeth in the*
onformity of our actions to the precept; the ſecondary leſs excellent Righ-
eouſneſs, (yet fitly enough ſo called) is when, though we have broke the
recepts, yet we have ſatisfied for our breach, either by our own ſufferings
r ſome other way. Compare we with that which he there ſpake
hat which here he ſpeaketh, and we ſhall finde him attributing
hat which he calleth *the primary moſt excellent and moſt proper righte-*
uſneſs to our ſelves, *viz.* our Conformity to the precepts of the
Goſpel; and that which he calleth the *ſecondary leſs excellent righte-*
uſneſs, to Chriſt, in and by whom we have ſatisfied for the breach
f the precepts of the Law. If this be not the nullifying, ſurely it
the abaſing of Chriſt. And he that would thus veil, will be rea-
y alſo to quench (as much as in him lyeth) the glory of Chriſts
ighteouſneſs.

3 What ſhew of truth is there in that which he aſſigneth, as the
auſe of his departing from the uſuall phraſe of Scripture to a
ew expreſſion of words, Calling Chriſt our *Legall*, and our own
ualifications and works our *Evangelicall Righteouſneſs*, which no
an ſince the very foundation of the world was laid (I think) e-
er ſo termed before him? *They ſo take their name* (ſaith he) *from*
he Covenant which is their Rule &c. and their *Denomination from the*
ormall Reaſon of the thing. To the unveiling of this Myſtery *Davus*
um non Oedipus. It muſt be ſome of *Pythagoras* his myſticall, and not
f *Ariſtotles* Dialectick learning, that muſt ſo bring this about that
e may finde and fathom it. For firſt how is the Law of Nature
r Covenant of works the rule of Chriſts Mediation, or ſatisfacti-

on

on made for us? Whether we Conſider it as it was fullfilled by Chriſt, or as it is apprehended by us to righteouſneſs, is the Law or old Covenant made with mankinde a rule or direction to him or us? Did this law at all either binde or direct the eternall Son of the eternall God to aſſume our Nature, and in it to offer himſelf a ſacrifice for our ſinn, and ſo make ſatisfaction to divine Juſtice? Indeed as in Chriſts ſufferings we ſee him onely a patient, drawn and dragg'd to judgement and death for our iniquities laid on him, ſo was his paſſion the effect of the Law. But if there were no more to be ſeen in his ſufferings, he ſhould not have been our righteouſnes either Legall or Evangelicall. For what merit could there be in a ſuffering of Conſtraint and Compulſion? But when in his ſufferings he was a voluntary agent, *Called and Conſecrated by the Father to be our Prieſt*, Heb. 5.5. *No man taking his life from him, but himſelf laying it down of himſelf, for us and in our ſtead*, Joh. 10.18. Thus he became the purchaſer of righteouſnes for us, *and is made of God Righteouſnes to us*, 1 Cor. 1.30. But all this he did not by the rule of the Law or Covenant of works, but of the ſecret and ſacred Covenant made between the Father and him: Therefore having mentioned the voluntarines of his ſuffering in the fore-quoted *Joh*, 10.18. He addeth, *This Commandment have I received of my Father*, implying that this his ſatisfactory obedience in dying for us had its regulating not by the old Covenant of works, or any precept of the Law given to man, but by the Covenant which had paſſed between the Father and the Son in reference to man, and a ſecretall poſitive Commandment from the Father agreeing with the tenor of that Covenant. As for our apprehending and pleading the righteouſnes of Chriſt to Juſtification, impudency it ſelf will neither affirm it to be done by the rule of the Covenant of law and works; nor deny it to be done in Conformity to the Covenant of grace and rule of the Goſpel. Or becauſe Chriſt hath born the penalty of the Lawes breach, ſhall he therefore be Called our legall righteouſnes, as from the *formall reaſon of the thing?* Nay both that Chriſt ſuffered, and the Father received and accepted his ſufferings in full ſatisfaction for our tranſgreſſions; That the Father ſent him to ſatisfie the juſtice of his law for us; and for his ſatisfactions ſake he doth no more impute to us the breach of his Law; All this is the fruit of his grace and in conformity to the Goſpel and Covenant of grace; not to the Law and Covenant of works. Therefore if we give the denomination from the formall reaſon of the thing

we muſt call it our Evangelicall not Legall righteouſnes which is in Chriſt.

Touching the other oppoſite term, that any thing inherent in man, whether the gifts of grace, Faith, Repentance, Charity, &c. or their fruits and works, ſhould be called our Goſpel righteouſnes; I ſee no reaſon for it, neither can deviſe in what other ſenſe they may be ſo called, but by a Catachreſticall Ironia which names a thing and means the contrary. As the Mounteins are called *Montes quia minime movent*, Mounts or Movers becauſe they do in no wiſe Move: or as the *Fames Auri* is ſometimes called *ſacra* the inordinate deſire of money is termed holy, *quia minime ſacra ſed prorſus execrabilis*, becauſe it is in no caſe ſacred but wholly accurſed. So in no other ſenſe may this righteouſnes in ſelf be called Goſpel righteouſnes (in reference to Juſtification) but becauſe it is totally oppoſite to the doctrine and nature of the Goſpel, and becauſe the Goſpel doth wholly reject and abandon it. Mr. *Br.* peradventure may and will bring other reaſons, and where he doth it we ſhall take pains to examine them.

4 Why he calls beleeving or Faith to be our Goſpel righteouſnes, and whether it be to any other end, but with the Papiſts upon the ſame grounds to bring in good works to Juſtification alſo? If he deny this the whole ſequele of his Book will be an enditement of falſhood againſt him?

CHAP. XIV.

That which Mr. Baxter *brings to confirm the matter of this his Doctrine, examined and found both fallacious and empty: And what he addeth to mitigate the aſperity* (viz. *That we perform theſe conditions not by our own ſtrength, but by the grace of Chriſt*) *evidenced to be a meer ſhift borrowed from the Papiſts.*

Mr. *Baxter* after he hath thus made a flouriſh and nothing but a flouriſh to explain and defend his phraſe, and make odious the phraſe of Scripture; now proceedeth to confirm the matter of his doctrine. Let us ſee whether there be any thing Logicall or Theologicall, and not meerly ſophiſticall? He hath confeſſed before, p. 109. that ſome who are not *Antinomians* (but Orthodox

thodox Divines) have ſtartled at the expreſſions of his 19 and 20 Poſitions, *as conteining in them ſome ſelf-exalting horrid doctrine, therefore will he ſay ſomething thereto, by way of explication and confirmation.* Now having ſaid ſomething as bad as nothing to take off contention *about words*; what doth he add for the confirmation of the matter of his doctrine? He was to have proved 1 *That Goſpel righteouſnes*, or the *righteouſnes of the New Covenant conſiſteth not in the imputation of the righteouſnes which is by Chriſt to us*, but *in our own actuall and perſonall faith and obedience.* 2 That we muſt be *righteous in our ſelves firſt*, and then after be made *righteous by Chriſt.* 3 That the righteouſnes of the New Covenant is not ſufficient to juſtifie and ſave, but onely to *give us right to the righteouſnes of the old Covenant, which doth actually and immediately ſave and juſtifie.* 4 That thoſe gifts of grace, vertues, and endowments, that are required to our ſanctification are not the fruits but the cauſes of our juſtification, and conditions of our intereſt in Chriſt, and conſequently that our ſanctification hath a priority and goes before juſtification. Theſe were the points in which he acknowledgeth himſelf to *be down-right oppoſed by ſome and ſtartled at by others.* What doth he now ſay for the ſilencing of theſe down-right oppoſers and ſtartlers? Juſt ſo much as he that would confute all that *Bellarmine* had written, in three words, *viz. Bellarmine thou lieſt.* Or what brings he for the confirmation of thoſe his aſſertions wherein he is ſo oppoſed? Nothing but a fardle of ſophiſticall fallacies, conſiſting of begged principles, and homonymies of words. Firſt he cluſtereth together many Concluſions, without either premiſſes or proofs.

The righteouſneſſe of the New Covenant then being the performance of its conditions; this is his firſt Concluſion, which by the word (then) bearing the force of (therefore) he would inſinuate to lean upon ſome foregoing premiſſes, when contrariwiſe, there is not ſo much as a peble of four grains to ſuſtein it, not a word laid as the foundation thereof. It is the thing in queſtion, we deny it, he brings nothing to confirm it beſides his bare affirmation, which to us is no more, then a pillar of ſtraw to bear up a Caſtle.

And its conditions being our obeying the Goſpel or believing. This is his ſecond Concluſion, taken as granted, when contrariwiſe his oppoſers utterly deny it. And here he plaies alſo with an homonymy of words, as if faith and obeying the Goſpel, which in the Apoſtles ſenſe are, ſo in his ſenſe alſo were, the ſame thing, covering his poyſon

poyſon untill the feat be done by it. *It muſt needs be plain that on no other terms do we partake of the legall righteouſnes of Chriſt.* I will not ſay that *ſelf-confidence hath made the man mad,* but rather that he *thinks all the world mad* and in ſuch a ſottiſh ſlumber, that none can put a difference betwixt mid-day and mid-night. *It is plain,* by what light? by what argument? It is the thing in queſtion, and none untill Mr. *Br.* ever held forth this aſſertion in theſe his expreſſions. Yet it *muſt be plain, viz.* becauſe he hath ſaid it, ſo plain as a New world created in Mr. *Br.* fiſt, he that can ſee what is not, may ſee it. We deny both the righteouſnes which is by Chriſt to be a legall righteouſnes, and our own qualifications to be the terms and grounds upon which he is made to us Righteouſnes. And let the world judg whether he ſhew himſelf a Chriſtian Teacher or an Antichriſtian Impoſter, who having promiſed a confirmation of his ſtrange and before unheard of doctrine, brings nothing but flouriſhes of words to charm fools, not one argument or Scripture to ſatisfie the wiſe and conſcientious. Himſelf ſeeth the groſnes and palpablenes of his deluſions, and leſt his Reader ſhould ſtay in his meditations upon it to ſee it alſo, he haſteth to annex a fourth Concluſion, very plauſible to them whom he hopes to beguile, wherupon, as on a Croſs he naileth the picture of an *Antinomian* to crucifie him, that with this pleaſant ſpectacle, he may divert his Readers eyes from the nakednes and nothingnes of what went before, to the beholding of a new object ſet before him.

To affirm therefore that our Evangelicall or New Covenant Righteouſnes is in Chriſt and not in our ſelves, or performed by Chriſt and not by our ſelves, is ſuch a monſtrous piece of Antinomian Doctrine that no man &c. *ut ſupra.* Which is as much as if he had ſaid to his Reader, if upon the bare authority of my words (when I have no one good Argument to prove them) thou wilt not become a rank Papiſt; I will regiſter thee for an Antinomian, and make thee out to the world ſuch a Monſter that all ſhall abhor thee as unſufferable. With this Thunder-bolt he knows he ſhall ſhake into an *Ague* all thoſe that *Nicodemus*-like are Diſciples of Chriſt, but ſecretly for fear of the Jewes. Should they be ſuſpected of the leaſt tang of Antinomianiſm, they ſhould never more have a good look from the Scribes and Phariſees.

But he is not forthwith an *Antinomian* whom Mr. *B.* ſo termeth. If *Pythagoras* his tranſmigration of ſouls into new bodies were Canonicall, I ſhould conclude that the ghoſt of one of thoſe ghoſtly

Fathers of the Councell of *Conſtance* had crept into Mr. *B.* body. They to make *John Huſs* odious, painted an ugly Devill in paper, and crowned *John Huſs* therewith when they carried him to the ſtake to be burned, at the view whereof the people exulted in his death, as if they had ſeen ſome Witch or rather young Devill burned. So deals Mr. *B.* here with them which are truly Evangelical, inures upon them the black brand of *Antinomianiſm*, ſo to make truth in their mouth hatefull as well as the perſons.

But is it decreed that they are all *Antinomians* that hold, and that it is a *monſtrous piece of Antinomianiſm to hold, that our Evangelicall or New Covenant righteouſnes is in Chriſt not in our ſelves, performed by Chriſt and not by our ſelves?* If ſo, I much queſtion whether there will be found any one (ſave Mr. *B.* alone) in all the Reformed Churches that are or have been, but muſt bear the imputation of a *monſtrous Antinomian.* I will not be over confident of *Socinus, Arminius, Grotius* and their followers, becauſe I take them not for members but troublers of the Reformed Churches. For my part I know no difference about this point between the Orthodox and *Antinomians*: Both conſent 1 That our Goſpel-righteouſnes which worketh effectually to our Juſtification is in Chriſt, not in our ſelves, (ſave by imputation.) 2 That our Goſpel or New Covenant righteouſnes in reference to our ſanctification, is in Chriſt radically, but in us by derivation and influence, actually to ſanctifie us. 3 That our faith, repentance, obedience, holines, good works (though flowing from Chriſt himſelf into us) are the Goſpel or New Covenant Righteouſnes, not by which we are juſtified, but by which we are ſanctified. And let Mr. *B.* or any of his Diſciples produce that Orthodox man that ever called this doctrine *Antinomianiſm*, or that hath not ſhunned the contrary doctrine as Popiſh and Antichriſtian.

Yet Mr. *B.* finding himſelf bound by promiſe to prove many things (as was ſaid before) that his fallacious dealing might not be too notorious and ſhameſull, he chooſeth one of the many (leaving the reſt untouched) to ſpeak *ſomething to it*, (as he had ſaid) though not to prove it. And in that which he ſaith, there is nothing to confirm his own aſſertion, but a meer reviling abuſing & abaſing of them that aſſert the contrary, under the falſe imputation of *Antinomianiſm.* And here he comes upon the ſtage like *Hercules Furens*, who in a Phrenſie taking his Wife and Children to be a Lioneſs and her Whelps, falls upon them fiercly with his Clubb and

envenо-

avenomed Arrows untill he had utterly deſtroyed them. So Mr. in ſomewhat a like fit, not finding reall *Antinomians*, but making his fancy, imaginary Bug-bears and phantaſms of them, curſeth hem with Bell Book and Candle for ſaying that Chriſt hath fulfilled the conditions of the New as well as of the Old Covenant, and hat our Evangelical righteouſnes is not in our ſelves but in Chriſt. t the ſuppoſition of ſuch aſſertions, (which none ever laid down n theſe terms) the man is in a rage, beats the wind, and flings duſt n the Aire, cryeth *Blaſphemy, hereſie, impiety*, and enumerates *Abſurities upon abſurdities* ariſing from ſuch doctrine, all which I am not t leizure to tranſcribe, (it being all ſuperfluous and not to the purpoſe) but may be read at large *pag.* 111, 112, 113, of his Tractate. Iore proper ſhall it be for me here to make out Mr. *B.* either willing or unwilling miſtake herein, and then all his abſurdities will ither vaniſh into winde or return upon himſelf.

Firſt then as we deny not Faith in the Lord Chriſt, to be inſtrumentall to apprehend to our ſelves Chriſt for our juſtification, and declarative evidence to our own ſouls that we are actually juſtified y him; (as before hath been granted) ſo we affirm it to be hereicall and popiſh doctrine which Mr. *B.* doth here *pag.* 111 deliver, n aſſerting repentance, obedience, ſubmiſſion, *&c.* and afterward l other vertues and good works, to be conditions of the New Covenant, *viz.* by which as by our Goſpel righteouſnes we are, and ithout which preceding, we cannot be juſtified. For all theſe (in Mr. *B.* ſenſe) as *Auſtin* from the tenor of the Goſpel ſaith *Non precedunt juſtificandum, ſed ſequuntur juſtificatum:* are not the precedents ut fruits of juſtification.

2 We affirm Repentance, Obedience, Charity, *&c.* and all good orks which the Goſpel requireth, to be originally and materially he works and duties of the Law. Nature and naturall conſcience ſelf ſuggeſting to every of us both the reſt, and withall in caſe of ffence committed againſt God or man, to repent of it, to ſorrow or it, and at our utmoſt to make ſatisfaction for the offence. Yea even Faith in Chriſt, is in generall required by the Old Law and Covenant. We in no wiſe aſcribe to the Goſpel a creating of new oints of righteouſnes, or injoining of new duties which the Law id not at leaſt in generall bind us unto, (this opinion we leave as roper and peculiar to the *Socinians*) But a modification ſpiritualizing and appropriating the righteouſneſs and duties which the aw in generall commanded, to the now preſent lapſed condition

of

of man, to Gods preſent offers of grace, and our preſent neceſſities. Yea herein we have Mr. B. conſenting to us, who, *Theſ.* 30. and in Explication delivers his judgment herein to be fully one with the ſtream of Orthodox Divines. So that if we ſhould affirm that Chriſt hath beleeved, repented, ſorrowed, &c. for us and in our ſtead: it would not thence follow, that we pronounce Chriſt to have performed the conditions of the New but onely of the Old Covenant for us.

3 Yet are we far from affirming that Chriſt in the moſt ſtrict and proper ſenſe hath ſo beleeved, repented, &c. for us, that we ſhould be taken to have beleeved, repented, &c. not in our ſelves but in him and by him. But the reaſon why we neither affirm nor hold it, is not becauſe that theſe are our Goſpel righteouſnes or New Covenant conditions of righteouſneſs and life in the ſenſe before often mentioned, for we have denyed and do ſtill deny them to be ſuch: But 1 becauſe it is in queſtion whether the active righteouſnes of Chriſt be imputable to us for juſtification; And 2 if it were, yet were it an unchriſting of Chriſt to affirm him to have been ever in ſuch a ſtate and condition, that he had need of repentance or faith to the remiſſion of ſins. He took indeed our nature not the ſinfulnes of our nature; had our ſin imputed to him, or (as the Scripture phraſe expreſly ſpeaketh) laid on him, *Iſa.* 53. 6. to ſuffer and ſatisfie for it: but had no ſin of his own to repent of and mortifie, then had there not been vertue in his Prieſthood & ſacrifice to have expiated ours. And to ſay that he actually repented, ſorrowed, beleeved, &c. for the pardon of our ſins, we confes is a harſh, unproper and Catachreſticall locution. Yet we ſtill hold that the flawes and infirmities of our faith and repentance as well as our other iniquities were laid upon Chriſt, that he hath ſatisfied divine juſtice for them by his ſufferings; and that therefore God imputeth them not to us being once in Chriſt. Otherwiſe though they are parts of Goſpel righteouſnes to ſanctification, the ſin and infirmity that is in them, in not ſquaring fully with the Law their rule, would bring upon us condemnation.

Theſe things premiſſed, all the abſurdities which (to make the aſſertion odious) Mr. B. layeth upon us for affirming our New Covenant righteouſnes to be in Chriſt in the ſenſe mentioned and explained, and denying our faith, repentance, obedience, &c. to be our New Covenant righteouſneſſe to Juſtification; vaniſh into ſmoke. For

1 It implyeth not (as he ſaith it doth) *blaſphemy againſt Chriſt, or if he had ſin to repent of*, for we utterly deny that Chriſt hath beleeved or repented for us, otherwiſe then by ſatisfying juſtice for our not repenting, beleeving, &c. home to the rule of the Law.

2 Nor doth it *imply that Jewes, Pagans, and every one ſhall be ſaved*, becauſe Chriſt hath fulfilled the conditions of both Covenants for them, ſo that they are culpable in neither. For Chriſt hath not ſatisfied for the breach of (much leſs fulfilled) that which Mr *B.* called the conditions of the New Covenant, as ſuch conditions, &c. but as precepts of the old Covenant or Law of works. Or ſhould I ſay Chriſt hath ſatisfied onely for the Elect, will M. B. contradict?

3 If it ſhould follow hence that *the Elect then are righteous and juſtified* (viz. in Chriſt) *before they beleeve*; this would not ſound as an abſurdity to any other beſides them to whom truth is an abſurdity, as hath been before ſhewed.

4 Neither if it would follow hence that *beleeving is needleſs to juſtification*, would it alſo follow, *that it is needleſs to any other uſe?* This cannot fall from any other but a prophane mouth and ſelf-ſeeking man, that will have nothing done out of love and obedience to God, to glorifie him, but all out of ſelf-love for his own benefit onely. But I have before proved faith to be needfull to juſtifie us, to bring home into our own Conſciences the benefit and evidence of our Juſtification, even Faith acting in us, therefore Faith ſo acting in us is alſo needful to this as well as to other uſes, though Chriſt hath ſatisfied for the infirmity of it in reference to the Law.

5 It were no abſurdity to confeſs the *ſaved and the damned to be alike in themſelves and by nature* (before Juſtification) but *that the difference is onely in election and Chriſts intention.* Untill then the Holy Ghoſt pronounceth both to be *Children of wrath by nature*, Eph. 2. 3. both *to be ungodly*, Rom. 4. 5. what then is the difference in themſelves? But their beleeving and Juſtification puts a difference in their relation firſt, and then in their qualifications alſo, the one becoming ſanctified, the other remaining unholy ſtill. The reſt that is contained in this fifth place hath been objected before, and before anſwered.

6 What he ſaith in the ſixth place proceeds from the heat of paſſion and height of ſelf-confidence, not from ſtrength of reaſon, or evidence of Scriptures. Which of all the Lawes and precepts of Chriſt had Juſtification for its end, ſave that of Faith? Or who hath

hath confounded *Law and Goſpel, and overthrown all the Lawes and Precepts of Chriſt*, by removing Faith from operating in its office to this end? *Who hath contradicted the whole ſcope of Scriptures by denying Chriſt to be made under the Law, to have fulfilled the Law, to have born the curſe of the Law, or its impoſing upon all the neceſſity* (of duty) to perform our ſelves whatſoever the New Covenant requireth of us to Juſtification or Salvation? But that all which Mr. *B.* would make conditions of Juſtification, muſt be ſuch becauſe he will ſo have it, notwithſtanding all his bombaſticall noiſe of words, his great Cry and little wooll, will not be granted him. When he brings us his large *tranſcript of New Teſtament Scriptures*, I doubt upon due examination they will be found to make not for but againſt him.

What he inſtanceth, *p.* 113, 114, 115. of Mr. *Saltmarſh*, I cannot deny it, neither will I defend it. I remember that I did once read this paſſage in him, and it was the ſame in ſubſtance, as Mr. *B.* here tranſcribes him. It is not a grain or two of ſalt that can make his Argumentation there, enough ſavory: unleſs he mean by Chriſts repenting, beleeving, &c. his ſatisfying of Gods juſtice by his expiatory ſacrifice for the failings of our Faith and Repentance, as they held not up to the Lawes perfection, I diſlike it no leſs then Mr. *B.* But can we conjecture that Mr. *Saltmarſh* himſelf was not the firſt that diſliked it and all the reſt both good and bad of what he wrote in that Tractate? I have been told by ſome of his godly acquaintance, that the man had a naturall impotency of craziness in his brain. And the whirlwind of imaginations wherewith he was carried to a haſty taking up of opinions, and no les haſty hurling away of them again; the much of the top, and the little of the bottom of wit, the flaſhes of nimblenes, and the want of ſolidity and depth which he ſhewed in his writings, his inconſiſtency with himſelf, with others, with the Scriptures; his extreme mutability and roving from Tropick to Tropick without ſettledneſs any where, do in great meaſure prove the report to be true. And if ſo, he is to be pitied though his infirmities are not to be patronized. However this extravagancy of his into ſo looſe and careleſs expreſſions, doth neither juſtifie Mr. B. Tenents, nor ought to prejudice the Truth from which Mr. B. or any other hath erred. Neither doth Mr. B. captiouſnes ſo null my charity as to entertain the leaſt conjecture that ever *Maſter Saltmarſh* meant or thought that Chriſt had ſinne to repent of, or beleeved to obtein the pardon thereof.

Here

Here now wee finde Maſter *Baxter* returning from his irefull purſuit of his imaginary, not reall *Antinomians*, and of a dead mans Ghoſt that could neither ſee nor hear him. And when hee reviews what he had written, hee ſees it neither holpen nor amended by his hot words ſpent upon the wind. He had affirmed, that there is a two-fold Righteouſneſſe neceſſary to our Juſtification; one, the Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt imputed to us, the other a perſonall Righteouſneſſe, or Righteouſneſſe of our owne, inherent in our ſelves: And to this our own Righteouſneſſe had attributed an equall power with the Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt to our Juſtification, if not a power above, and ſuperiour to it. This aſſertion of his he perceives to ſavour ſo much of humane arrogance, and (to uſe his own words) to be a ſelf-exalting, horrid Doctrine, of ſo high a nature, and ſo contradictory to the whole Tenor of the Goſpel, that a ſhort affected brawl with No-bodies, and dead men, cannot turn away the hatred which all that know and love the Lord *Jeſus* muſt needs conceive againſt it. Hee is therefore in a ſtreight, cure it he cannot, revoke it he will not: Therefore in ſtead of a better ſhift, he poſteth to the Monks & Jeſuits, & borrows their either, Cowl, or Cloak, to cover the deformity of it. And good reaſon have they to ſtead him, for it is their cauſe in his hand, *viz.* Juſtification by our own perſonal Righteouſneſs, that hath ſtreightened him. Let us now ſee what he brings from them to us, to make their aſſertion from his pen tolerable.

B. *Theſ.* 21. 115. *Not that wee can perform theſe conditions without Grace: (for without Chriſt we can doe nothing) But that he enableth us to perform them our ſelves; and doth not himſelf repent, beleeve, love Chriſt, obey the Goſpel for us, as he did ſatisfie the Law for us.*

B. *Explication. This prevention of an objection I adde, becauſe ſome think it is a ſelf-aſcribing, and derogating from Chriſt, to affirm our ſelves to bee but the Actors of thoſe duties, though we profeſſe to doe it onely by the ſtrength of Grace. But that it is Chriſt that repenteth, and beleeveth, not we, is language ſomewhat ſtrange to thoſe that have been uſed to the language of Scripture, or Reaſon: Though I know there is a ſort of ſublime, Platonick, Plotinian Divines ſprung up of late among us, who think all things to bee but one,* &c.

We find in Scripture, that as Chriſt hath his *Myſtery*, ſo hath Antichriſt his *Myſtery* alſo: And that this latter is a *Myſtery of*

iniquity, 2 Theſſ. 2. 7. and *Myſtery*, *Babylon the great*, *&c.* And it is ſomewhat myſterious and ſtrange that the materials of this Babel-building will not hold and cloſe together without Babel ſlime to cement it. Mr. *Baxter* would fain have fortified, and faſtened together the gaping chinks of this *Babel* with his own morter. But it will not hold, therefore is he forced ever and anon to make uſe of the proper ſlime which the former Builders have left for them that come after to repair; ſo doth hee in this place. None of his own ſhifts and tricks could hide the menſtruouſneſs, and monſtrouſneſs of his Doctrine; this Pall from *Rome* doth it no leſs perfectly then the Fig-leaf Aprons covered the nakedneſs and filthineſs of our firſt Progenitors from the eye of God. It ſounded before ſo dreadfully, as it was enough to make the ears of a true Chriſtian to tingle at the hearing, that *Our own righteouſneſſe muſt goe foot by foot with Chriſts righteouſneſſe to our Juſtification*; but that which Mr. *Baxter* brings home from *Rome*, takes off the ghaſtlyneſs, and makes all ſmooth, and himſelf in what he hath ſaid no leſs amiable then he that had the Lambs horns, but the voice of the Dragon, *Rev.* 13. 11. How ſhould it bee otherwiſe when all the glory is aſcribed to God's Grace and to the Spirit, and Power of Chriſt? ſo ſaith he. *We are juſtified* in part by our own righteouſnes indeed, [yet] *not that we performe in this Righteouſneſſe* [which he termeth the conditions] *without Grace*, (*for without Chriſt wee can do nothing*) *but hee enableth us to perform them*, *&c.* And in the Explication: *This prevention of an objection I adde, becauſe ſome thinke it a ſelf-aſcribing, and derogating from Chriſt, to affirm our ſelves to bee the Actors of theſe duties, though we profeſſe to doe it only by the ſtrength of Grace.* Now what Mr. *Baxter* hath thus ſayd and profeſſed, what reaſon can there be given why he ſhould not bee thought as honeſt and innocent as the proudeſt Popiſh Prelates, Jeſuits, and Friars, that in anſwer to this objection which Mr. *Baxter* preventeth here, have ſaid and profeſſed the ſame thing over and over many hundred times? In ſtead of them all (which even to name with their words abbreviated, would fil a volumne) I ſhall mention ſome few only. First the Popiſh gloſſe thus ſpeaketh, *Opera noſtra, quatenus noſtra ſunt, vim nullam Juſtificandi obtinent*; *quatenus verò non à nobis ſunt, ſed in nobis à Deo facta ſunt per Gratiam, Juſtificationem promerentur, i. e.* Our works as farre as they are ours, have no pow-

Gloſa ordinaria in cap. 6. ad Rom. ver. 23.

to justifie: but as farre as they are not from us, but wrought of God by Grace in us, so they deserve justification. In the same manner our English Jesuit *Campian* is recorded in the dispute which hee had with some of our English Divines to have sought an evasion: *Opera quidem legis* (saith he) *quatenus sine fide & gratia geruntur, nihil habere quod ad justitiam conferant: Caterum opera sanctorum Hominum cum ejusmodi non sint, sed fide & gratia referta, ideo justificari dicuntur verè coram Deo, ex operibus suis, non tamen tanquam suis. i. e.* The workes of the Law, as they are done without Faith and Grace, have nothing to contribute to Justification; nevertheless the workes of godly men are not of that kind, but repleni shed with Grace and Faith; therefore are they sayd to bee justified by their workes, yet not by workes as theirs [but as wrought by the grace of God in them.] So also *Vega* the Monk, *Duplex est Justificatio, altera ex gratia operandi infusa; altera ex debito Legis, secluſa Gratia: Excluditur ergo Justificatio illa quæ fit secluſa gratia: non Justificatio illa quæ fit ex operibus gratia adjutis, &c. i. e.* There is a two-fold Justification, one of the Grace to work infused into us, the other of the debt of the Law without Grace [to enable.] That Justification is excluded which is [sought after] without Grace, not that Justification which is of good works holpen by Grace. And *Hosius*, to elude that of the Apostle, *We are not justified by works; Verum, inquit, ex operibus iis quæ legis sunt, aut quæ liberi Arbitrii nostri propria existunt; quæ cum laborant imperfectione, nihil ad justificationem conferunt. i. e.* It is true (saith he) of those works which are of the Law, or done in the strength of Free-will only, which in regard they have their imperfection, cannot avail to Justification. But as for such works as flow from our Free-will, as it is set in operation by the over-powering of Gods Grace, He concludeth otherwise. Not to trouble our selves with what these Sophistical pratlers speak every, and each of them severally, let us take them collectively in one bunch and body, as Mr. *Pemble* in his Treatise of *Justification* brings them in both head and tayle, great and small, thus disputing against Justification by the righteousnes which is in Christ, without any righteousnes of our own intermixed. Against this Doctrine they have two exceptions (saith Mr. *Pemble*)

Campian.

Andr. Vega de Just. pag. 751.

Hosius.

Pemb. Treat. of Justif page 37.

1. *That we are not justified by any work of our own* (viz.) *that we our selves do by our own strength without the help of Grace: But*

yet we may be justified by some work which we doe (viz.) *by the act of Grace; such is the work of Faith.*

2. *That wee are not justified by any workes of our own, i. e. by any works of the Law; but by a work of the Gospel, such as Faith is, we may be justified.*

By this time it is enough evident that Mr. *Baxter* fights the Popes battel with the Popes weapons, that as he maintaines the Popes cause, so he rankes and files himself with the souldiers of the Popes Army; who then can give any reason why hee should not be thought as sure a friend either to Christ, or at least to Antichrist, as are the Priests and Jesuits? Onely if for no other, yet for this cause Mr. *Pemble* deserves the brand of an *Antinomian*, (which in the following part of his Tractate Mr. *Baxter* gives him pag. 173.) for disgracing this sophisticall shift which is common to other Papists with Mr. *Baxter*, telling us in the forequoted place, that *this distinction of works done without Grace, and works done by Grace, was devised by one* (*and consequently followed by others*) *that had, or have neither Wit nor Grace; being a trick to elude the force of such Scriptures, as exclude indefinitely all works from Justification, &c.* A spightful speech, thus at once to cast dirt in the faces both of Mr. *Baxter*, and all his *fratres*, or Fryars of the holy Mother Church of *Rome*. No marvel if Mr. *Baxter*, though he smooth him somtimes for his own ends, yet doth carry him in mind to fit him a penny-worth for it, when he thinks he hath caught an advantage against him.

Nevertheless though Mr. Baxters *ingenuity and plaine dealing seldom keep him company in this dispute and controversie, yet his subtilty and sophistry fail him never.* In his former positions before examined, he affirms, that besides the imputed righteousnes, we must have a personal righteousnes inherent in our selves, as absolutely necessary to salvation and justification: Here now to make that his assertion sufferable, he minceth it in its termes, and in this Thesis calls it a *performance of conditions*, and in the Explication, *an Acting of Duties*, what before he had called *justifying righteousnesse*: Yea further tels us, that some think it a *self-ascribing, and derogating from Christ to affirm our selves to be but the Actors of those Duties; though we professe our selves to do it only by the strength of Grace.* When contrariwise the question is not about either the requisiteness of Gospel duties, nor about the strength by which they are to be performed; (herein if Mr. *Baxter* meaneth

as

he speaketh, wee are agreed) but about their office and end which they are to be performed; whether these duties are onditions of our Justification, and that the end of our perform-g them ought to be, that we may be justified by the righteous-s which consisteth in their performance? Doth hee meane to ne up a *Palinodiam*, to recant and eat up his former asserti-s, that he doth here so lenifie the roughnes, and correct the travagancy both of his words and matter before delivered? othing les, but hee throws sugar after his poyson, both that may goe down the more quietly what he hath given already to s unwary Readers to drink, and that they may be ready with-t suspition to drink deeper, and more deadly draughts of the me poyson, which thorow the whole sequele of this his Trea-e he makes his business to temper for them. I shall there an-er more fully where he speakes more fully. In the mean time may see his dealing here to be not faire and logical, but fal-cious and sophistical.

He tels us in the conclusion of his Explication, that *He will not gres from his intended subject so far, as to enter here into a disquisi-n of the nature and workings of that Grace which doth enable us to form these conditions, but refers us to* Parkers *Theses de traductio-e peccatoris ad vitam.*

What that Mr. *Parker*, or his work is, I know not. But that Mr. *xter* will not here deliver his own judgement, I think he doth ll. For if his judgement in the doctrine of Gods Grace work-g unto mans conversion, and sanctification, be not more sound n about the operation of the same Grace to mans Justification, silence will be farre more acceptable then his best argumenta-ons, to chaste ears, and spiritual minds. And little cause have to expect any good from him upon that subject, because that hough there are many who extoll the power of mans Free-ll to his conversion, even to the clouding of the glory of race, that do notwithstanding hold fast the doctrine of Justifica-n by Christ alone, without any intermixture of our own righ-ousnesse: Yet I know no one sort or sect of men that part our stification between Gods righteousnes imputed, and our own herent, but that the same also, about the doctrine of Free-will, wholly Popish, if not Pelagian also.

n the busk and body of his Explication, wherein he inveigh- against those whom hee in termes of abasement calleth sub-

lime, Platonick, and Plotinian Divines, when as they acco themselves essentially God himself; he hath not us differe from him.

Chap. XV.

Whether men in Scriptures are said to be personally Righte because they perform works and duties, as conditions of new Covenant, yea only *for this? Master* Baxters *reas which he labours to make it good, examined.*

Thesis 22.

Bax. page 118. *In this fore-explained sense it is, that in Scripture are said to be personally Righteous: and in sense it is, that the faith and duties of beleivers are s please God: viz. as they are related to the Covenant of G and not as they are measured by the Covenant of Works.*

Explication.

Those that will not acknowledge that the Godly are called Ri ous in the Scripture by reason of a personal Righteo consisting in the Rectitude of their own dispositions and ons, as well as in regard of their imputed Righteousnes be convinced from these Scriptures if they will beleive t Gen. 7. 1. and 18. 23, 24. Job 17. 9. Psal. 1. 5, 6. 37. 17, 21. Eccles. 9. 1, 2. Ezek. 18. 20. 24. and 33. 13. 18. Mat. 9. 13. [To these he addeth, as may be t read, a multitude of Scriptures more, which unles were to better purpose, it is not worthy the labou tran'scribe.] To this he further addeth.]

That men are sometimes called Righteous in refere the Lawes and judgements of men, I acknowledge: A regard of some of their particular actions, which are s substance good; and perhaps sometimes in a compa sense, as they are compared with the ungodly: as a lin crooked, should be called streight in comparison of on crooked. But how improper an expression that is, yo easily perceive. The ordinary phrase of Scripture hath

truth and aptitude then ſo. Therefore it muſt needs be, that men are called righteous, in reference to the New Covenant onely. Which is plain thus, Righteouſneſſe is but the denomination of our actions or perſons as they relate to ſome rule. This Rule, when it is the law of Man, and our actions ſuit thereto, we are then righteous before men. When this rule is Gods Law, it is either that of Workes, or that of Grace. In relation to the former there is none Righteous, no not one; for all have ſinned and come ſhort of the glory of God. Onely in Chriſt who hath obeyed and ſatisfied, wee are Righteous. But if you conſider our actions and perſons in relation to the Rule of the New Covenant, ſo all the regenerate are perſonally righteous: becauſe they all performe the conditions of this Covenant, and are properly pronounced righteous thereby. Neither can it be conceived how the works of beleivers ſhould either pleaſe God, or be called righteouſneſſe, as they relate to that old Rule, which doth pronounce them unrighteous, hatefull and accurſed.

All this (in its ſubſtance at leaſt) might be granted to a conſcientious man, that meaneth as he ſpeaketh, hating all equivocations and mentall reſervations. For it being firſt granted to us what is here granted) That men are called in Scripture, Righteous, ſometimes in *Regard of their imputed Righteouſneſſe*, ſometimes *in reference to the lawes and judgements of Men*, ſometimes ſo *in regard of ſome of their particular actions, which are for their ſubſtance good*: and ſometimes *in a comparative ſenſe, as they are compared with the ungodly*: The 3 laſt of theſe conſiſting in the Conformity of perſons and actions with the Lawes of God, or of men, though not a perfect Conformity: upon this firſt yeelded to us, we could without any prejudice to truth grant back again to ſuch qualified men as are before mentioned, that ſometimes men are called [perſonally] *Righteous, in reference to the New Covenant*, i. e. in regard of their inchoat *ſanctification*, and an inherent righteouſneſſe flown out of Chriſt into them, by means of their union unto Chriſt; for which (though not yet Complete and perfect in them,) they are, *à parte præſtantiore*, termed Righteous.

But to Maſter *Baxter*, whom we have as the wolfe by the ears, prepared if we hold him, to bite at our hands, if we let him go,

to

to fall upon our throats, or invade our face and head; if we deny him what he would have, to bite at us; if we grant it him, to improve it againſt Chriſt our head; we grant nothing, wee can grant nothing, becauſe in all that he ſpeaketh, he means not as he ſpeaketh, but covers under fine words fallacies and falſities.

Firſt then, we except againſt his Theſis, that it is a meer fardle of Amphibologies and Equivocations. That he ſo delivers all, that he will be held to nothing. For firſt, when he ſaith *In the fore-explained ſenſe it is*, his meaning was (no doubt) to leave us doubtfull, or at leaſt to leave himſelfe this advantage, that wee ſhould remain uncertain where to find him. If we ſhould fetch the explanation from the next Theſes, he might excepct that his meaning was of ſome of the more remote Theſes; if from the remote, he would fly to the next; or if wee ſhould draw the ſenſe from both the next and remote Theſes, he might evade thus, that he meant not any thing that was ſaid in any of his Theſes, but ſomething in the explication of ſome of them. And thus wee might purſue the wild-gooſe long enough, before wee ſhould finde her pitching.

Secondly, When he ſaith, *Men in Scriptures are ſaid to be perſonally righteous*, his purpoſe was to leave us in the like doubt, whether he means the *Righteouſneſſe of juſtification*, or the *Righteouſneſſe of Sanctification*; and himſelfe the like advantage to fly from the one to the other, as may moſt further his ends.

Thirdly, when he ſaith again, *And in this ſenſe it is*, he leaves us as knowing as before, what ſenſe he meaneth, himſelfe hath not yet concluded what the ſenſe ſhall be, ſaving in general, ſuch a ſenſe as upon all occaſions may ſerve to his purpoſes.

Fourthly, When he ſaith, *That the faith and duties of believers are ſaid to pleaſe God.* viz. *As they are related to the Covenant of Grace, and not as they are meaſured by the Covenant of works*; he had a project to leave us uncertain, whether by the word *They* and *They* twice uſed, he means *thoſe beleevers*, or *thoſe duties and works*. And upon this hinge runs the queſtion in great part between us and the Papiſts, whether the works make the perſon, or the new relation of the perſon make his works accepted.

And in the Fift place, no leſſe ambiguity is there in the phraſe, Related to the Covenant of Grace, not to the Covenant of works. For in many reſpects may a perſon or thing be related to either Covenant, and he tells us not in what reſpect he meaneth.

Now

Now though from the whole ſcope of his worſt we may aſſure our ſelves that he would be underſtood in the worſt, *i. e.* in the Popiſh ſenſe, in reference to all theſe things which he delivers in ſuch words as may bear a manifold ſenſe: yet becauſe the man delights to dance in the dark that he may not be yet taken, wee will neither croſſe his humor, nor befool our ſelves in dancing after him, untill he ſhall diſcover himſelf and his meaning in the light.

To the explication I except, that it is full of extravagancies, equivocations, contradictions, ſaying and gainſaying, doing, and undoing, mentall reſervations, and in all of fallacious ſubtilties. Firſt he racks & rakes together Scriptures in heaps to prove that a mans eyes are in his head, not in his heeles; I mean, to confirm that which no rational man ever denyed, *viz.* that ſometimes men are called righteous by reaſon of a perſonal righteouſneſſe &c. what an extravagancy is this, ſo ſtrongly to fortifie, where there is no fear of an aſſault? But there lurketh here a twofold fallaciouſneſſe and ſubtilty of Maſter *Baxter.* 1 a trick to delude his inconſiderate readers that view his words running, without any ſtay or ſtopping to conſider with an opinion that he hath all the Old and New Teſtaments on his ſide, in that hee can ſpit Scriptures ſo ſwiftly and numerouſly for himſelfe. 2. a feat to ſcrew into the mindes of unwary men a conceit, that all theſe Scriptures, (which he confides they will not examine) doe hold forth juſtification by our own perſonal, or inherent righteouſneſs. Which they do no more prove, then a crow upon a ſheeps back proves the ſheep to be a crow, or a red hat forced upon Maſter *Baxters* head proves him to be a Cardinal: Yet this muſt hee mean and aim at, elſe (to uſe the very ſame words which he before uſed againſt Maſter *Saltmarſh*) his Argumentation is no more to the buſineſſe that he hath in hand, then a harp to a harrow. For it is not the righteouſneſſe of ſanctification, but of juſtification that is the ſubject of his diſpute.

2. He is liberal in his conceſſions, grants us firſt that the Scripture calls men righteous ſometimes in regard *of their imputed righteouſneſſe*; and when they are ſo called in reſpect of their inherent righteouſneſſe, it is ſometimes in *reference to the lawes and judgements of men*; Alſo [ſometimes] in regard of *ſome of their particular actions which are in their ſubſtance good*: (viz. therein conformed to the law.) And ſometimes in a *comparative ſenſe*,

as they are compared with the wicked, &c. Yet with one flat contradiction recalls all again, thus, *Therefore it must needs be that men must be called Righteous in reference to the New Covenant onely*, Who ever heard untill now of such a conclusion from such premisses. If because we are sometimes in Scripture called righteous in regard of imputed Righteousnesse, which (according to Master *Baxters* Divinity) is our legal righteousnesse, and in regard of these other waies which he mentioneth, none of which relateth to the New Covenant, how doth it follow hence, *Ergo*, men are called righteous in reference to the New Covenant onely? In this, his Logick is no lesse mystical then his Divinity. I can see no other ground of such an argutation instead of an Argumentation, But this; Master *Baxter* hath granted, and laid the premisses, *Ergo, earum contrarium verum est, i.e.* Therefore the contrary to what he saith must needs be true. But paradventure he drawes the conclusion not from those concessions; but onely from the words next & immediately going before, viz. *The ordinary phrase of Scripture hath more truth and aptitude then so, Therefore* &c. Did he not grant that the Scriptures do call men righteous in all the former mencioned respects? what is it then that he here saith *The ordinary phrase of Scripture hath more truth &c.* Are some Scriptures more true then others? And therefore doth he reject that which is affirmed by the lesse true, & conclude that which is affirmed by the more true Scriptures? or can hee deny the Scriptures sometimes to call men righteous in the former respects? No marvell if he doth so prophanely wrest and abuse the Scriptures, when he takes them for such false and uncircumcised things, that in his account they need also an inherent truth and righteousnesse to justifie them.

I should here prove, that men are called *Righteous, not in reference to the New Covenant onely*. But let him first bring his proofs to confirm the contrary, and I stand waiting to answer him. This he attempts to do in the next words: Wherein wee shall find him bringing nothing else but some vain and loose propositions, fallaciously and sophistically disposed, laying them down as known principles, when they are the very things in question (for the most part of them) yet Confirming them with no other authority than his own bare affirmation and Negation, as if every paradox must be taken as sacred and undisputable, when he hath, and because hee hath delivered it. It is plain thus (saith he;)

B. *Righteousnesse is but the Denomination of our actions and persons, as related to some Rule.*

The

He had before said in the Explication of *Thes.* 16. pag. 96. *That Righteousness is no proper real being, but a Modificatio entis*, the Modification of a being. This he means also here in calling it the *Denomination* of our persons and actions as related to some Rule. But what end hee hath in degrading Righteousness from the honour of a positive reall being, more then other virtues, I do but yet kenn at a distance, and not fully comprehend. This wee clearly see that he takes the chair, and challengeth to himself a Magisterial power to create and destroy what his Cap thinks fit in Philosophy, Logick, and Divinity. A famous Doctor, long versed in more sublime, and profound studies, and by means thereof having let slip some of the poor elementary rules of Grammar, having once by a mistake broken *Priscians* head, being admonished, thereof is said in great haste to have answered, He would make a New Grammar, that should conform to the incongruity of his words, seeing his words were unconform to the congruity of Grammar. Such is the animosity of Mr. *Baxter*, where his opinions agree not with the rules of Philosophy, or Divinity, there he damns and annihilates the old, and with the breath of his mouth creates a new Philosophy, and Divinity, that shall be subservient to his opinions, and so God-like,

Dirnit, ædificat, mutat quadrata rotundis.

This he doth here in defining, or describing righteousness, denying it a positive, and reall being; herein puffing off all the Classicall Philosophers, and Divines. Philosophers; for *Aristotle* affirmeth, that all [Philosophers] call Righteousnesse, τοιάυτην ἕξιν ἀφ' ἧς πρακτικοὶ τῶν δικαίων εἰσὶ, καὶ ἀφ' ἧς δικαιοπραγοῦσι καὶ βούλονται τὰ δίκαια. Such an habit by which men are apt to practise just things, and by which they act and will just things. And to them he gives also his assent, calling it further ἀρετὴν τελείαν, not onely a virtue, but a perfect virtue, citing and approving that Proverbial verse,

Ἐν δὲ δικαιοσύνῃ συλλήβδην πᾶς ἀρετή 'στι.

That all [or every] vertue is complexively [or comprehensively] in Righteousness. Yea the most perfect virtue, τελεία μάλιστα ἀρετὴ; and again it is (saith he) κρατίστη τῶν ἀρετῶν, the most excellent of virtues, ἐ μέρει ἀρετῆς ἀλλ' ὅλη ἀρετὴ, not a part of virtue, but virtue in the whole. So speakes he of Righteousnesse in the general, and as in the next Chapters he distributes it into its specials, he makes virtue the general of those several Righteousnesses.

In the ſame manner the choiceſt of all the learned and Orthodox Divines that I have met with, make Righteouſneſs thus taken in its largeſt ſenſe, to ſound, and to bee one and the ſame thing with virtue it ſelf. Some call it *bonitatem, probitatem, & integritatem*, goodneſſe, honeſty, and integrity; others, *rectitudinem virtutis*, the uprightneſſe, or rectitude of Virtue, defining its ſpecials by Virtue, when they aſſign the next and immediate *genus*; by *habitus*, when they aſſign the remote *genus*. And are not Virtues, and either naturall, morall, or infuſed Habits, Poſitive, and Reall Beings? Muſt all other Philoſophers and Divines vaniſh to nothing, when Mr. *Baxter* comes with his *Denominations, Modifications*, or rather *Noddifications*?

Nevertheleſſe though we deny to him that Righteouſneſſe is but a bare *Denomination*, or dead notion; yet we grant to him that true righteouſneſs both of Mens Actions and perſons muſt relate to ſome rule. What will follow hence?

B. *This Rule, when it is the law of Man, and our actions ſuit thereto, we are then Righteous before men.*

True, and yet *latet anguis in herba*, under this truth there lurketh a fraudulent falſhood. Mr. *Baxter* hath his reſtrictions to promote, but not to prevent a falſhood. The thing that he pretends to prove, is, That men are called *Righteous* [in Scripture] in reference to the New Covenant *onely*. There he finds the word *onely* to make a falſhood. Here he cannot find it, will not finde it; for if it bee brought in place, it will reprove him of falſhood to all men. Is it for mens actions ſuiting to the Lawes of men *onely*, that they are called in Scripture *righteous* before men? He would be ſo underſtood; for if it be not onely for this, if at all for their outward and appearing conformity to the Law of God, they are called *Righteous before, or in the account of men*, his concluſion is deſtroyed by this prop which he brings to ſuſtain it. And yet he dares not to ſay, *onely* for this they are called Righteous before men. For he knoweth whole ſtreames of Scriptures would be brought to confute ſo bold an aſſertion. But he proceedeth.

B. *When this Rule is Gods Law, it is either that of Workes, or that of Grace: In relation to the former there is none righteous, no not one, &c.* ut ſupra.

This

This, and that which followeth is all sophisticall, fallacious, and catching.

First the distinction which he here maketh of the Law of God, that it is either the Law of Works, or Law of Grace, is somewhat a strange phrase to chaste ears, that desire to hear Scripture doctrines delivered in Scripture termes, that oppose Grace to the Law, and are not wont to call it a Law.

Secondly, it is contrary to Mr. *Baxters* doctrine and Gospel: for howsoever he in words talketh of a two-fold Covenant of Works and of Grace, to beguile such as desire to be beguiled; yet really hee labours to bring all under a Covenant of Works, making mans own righteousnesse the condition of both, so altering the name, but retaining the nature and power of the first Covenant still; as I have before evinced from his disputes, and himself will in the following part of his book discover more fully.

3. There is an ambiguity in the word *Rule*, he manifesteth not how farre his meaning therein in reference to the Law extendeth, whether for a direction onely what is good, and what is evill, wherewith God will be served, and what is it that offendeth him, teaching us to perform the one, and to shun the other: Or whether also for a direction how far, & in what degrees the good is to be done, and the evill shunned, that we may bee justified and saved thereby. Though we may without much difficulty smell his meaning herein, yet because he reserveth it for another place clearly to expresse himselfe, we also will reserve it for the same place to make him a full answer.

4. He playeth his usuall game of equivocation, in telling us, that *In relation to the former there is none righteous, no not one.* This is not that which is concluded, and nothing ought to be in the conclusion, which is not also in the premises. The conclusion (as we have seen) is that none is *called* righteous, *&c.* The proof here is, that none *is* righteous. These phrases much differ. A man may be called righteous, in reference to the rule of the Law, though he be not absolutely righteous, in every particular thereto Justification; and himself acknowledgeth that in many respects the Scripture calleth men righteous, in reference to the Law of Works, who notwithstanding shall never be justified by the Law of Works; as a little before in this *Explication* we have seen. *Concerning the Righteousnesse which is by the Law, I was blamelesse*, saith the Apostle, *Phil.* 3. 6. And, *I have lived in all good*

Conſcience unto this day, Act. 23. 1. Lo even while *Paul* was yet *Saul*, a hater, a perſecuter of the Goſpel Righteouſneſſe, yet he is termed, and called *Righteous*, *blameleſly Righteous*, *conſcientiouſly righteous*, in relation to the Law of Works. Or when *Judah* ſaith of *Tamar*, *She is*, or *Saul* of *David*, *Thou art more righteous then I*; and *Solomon* of *Joab*, *Two men more righteous then himſelf*. *Gen.* 38. 26. 1 *Sam.* 24. 17. 1 *Kings* 2. 32. Were theſe here called Righteous in reference to the righteouſneſs of the Goſpell, and not of the Law? Or when the Lord by his Prophet calls the righteous which *turned from their righteouſneſſe, and periſhed in and for their wickedneſſe*. Ezek. 3. 20, 21. and 18. 20, 24, 26. and 33. 12, 13, 18. was it an Evangelical, or a legal Righteouſneſſe that gave them the denomination of *Righteous perſons*? When *Iſaiah* calls all his, all the peoples *Righteouſnes*, *menſtruous or filthy Ragge*, and Paul his *Righteouſneſſe*, *Dung* Iſa. 64. 6. Phi. 3. 9. yet both ſuch as gave them the denomination of *Righteous men*, Mr. *Baxter* himſelf will not ſay, that theſe were the righteouſneſſe of the New Covenant: I could heap, and hoard up Scriptures to the ſame purpoſe which call men righteous in reference to the Law of Works: But in what reſpects men are called ſo in Scripture; for an unperfect righteouſneſs is not the thing in queſtion. Not that they were juſtified by it, is certain; but in whatſoever other reſpects, it deſtroyeth Mr. *Baxters* concluſion, that men are called Righteous in relation to the Covenant of Grace *onely*, and ſhews the inconſequence of his Argumentation, that becauſe none is perfectly righteous, *viz.* to Juſtification in relation to the Law of Works, *Ergo*, in no other reſpect is he *called* Righteous according to the Covenant of Works.

What he addeth, *Onely in Chriſt, who hath obeyed, and ſatisfied we are Righteous.* This we embrace as our Goſpel *Righteouſneſſe*, and Mr. *Baxter* alone without company, or ſuffrage of Prophet or Apoſtle, Ancient, or Modern Writers, affirms to be our legal Righteouſneſs. But hitherto we finde it an affirmation without confirmation. It follows.

Bax. *But if you conſider our actions and perſons in relation to the Rule of the New Covenant, ſo all the Regenerate are perſonally righteous, becauſe they all perform the conditions of this Covenant, and are properly pronounced Righteous thereby. Neither can it be conceived how the works of Elect ſra-*

should either please God, or be called Righteousness, as they relate to that old Rule, which doth pronounce them unrighteous, hatefull, and accursed.

He proceeds still in his sophistry without any the least particle of Scripture, or any thing else, save the wind of wit and words to prove what he would have us to beleeve. It behoveth him that will fasten and screw into the judgements of men new, and strange Doctrines, that never sounded before (at least in the same phrase of words) in their ears, to bring irrefragable Arguments to confirm it. But such paradoxes and prodigies both of doctrines and words, doth Mr. *Baxter* here hold forth, as were never before heard of, but in uttering them he is a *Barbarian* to us, and we *Barbarians* to him, in not understanding them, yet brings nothing else but his own word to promote them. The mysteries of his sophistry are so deep, that our woodden wits cannot sink to the bottome to comprehend and understand it.

First, what means he by the Rule of the New Covenant? Doth he put the New Covenant here in the Passive, or in the Active, and Possessive sense? *i.e.* Doth hee meane by the Rule of the New Covenant a rule extrinsecall, and without the New Covenant, to which the New Covenant must bee conformed, that it may bee regular; or a rule in the New Covenant, and by it made out to us, whereunto wee must bee conformed? If in this latter sense, then whether without, or else with reference to some end? if to some end, whether then to Sanctification or Justification? I cannot so much as conjecture that he puts the phrase in the first sense, that he tels us here of a Rule to which the New Covenant must be conformed, because it is altogether alien from the scope of his dispute; and besides how we should be related to a rule with which the New Covenant must suit, I cannot see; for such a rule I should conceive to be immanent in God, and so hid from us, that we cannot perceive how to regulate our selves by it. This then he cannot mean.

2. Neither doe I conceive that his meaning is, that we are to be conformed to the Rule which is contained in, and manifested by the New Covenant, without respect to any end to which the Rule directeth; that we ought to be thus and thus qualified, and thus to act onely, because the Gospel so biddeth, without reference to the end of such qualifications and actings: For neither is

is this any thing to the purpose of his dispute. Neither in this sense can such qualifications and actings be in any shew of reason called, what Mr. *Baxter* here calleth them, *Conditions of the New Covenant*: For they are Conditions (if at all Conditions) in reference to some ends, without which the end cannot be obtained. Or what ends doth the New Covenant immediately point at more then either our Justification or Sanctification?

3. If he mean the Rule of the New Covenant for Sanctification. 1. Then I shall demand of him, whether the Law of Works be not the rule of the matter and substance of those qualifications and actions which conduce to Sanctification, even under the New Covenant; and whether the Rule of the New Covenant or Gospel doe extend any further then to the Modification of those Qualifications and Actions, directing to the Mediator from whom to derive those Qualifications and Actions, and by, and through whom to present our selves and them unto God? 2. And then, whether in reference to Sanctification, men may not be called Righteous, as having their righteousnes relating to the rule of the Old, as well as the New Covenant? I cannot be so uncharitable to think that Mr. *Baxter*, having positively affirmed that beleevers are in part under the Curse of the Law, will deny them to be also in part under the rule and direction of the Law; if he should, hee must brand upon himself the due infamy of Antinomianism, which he unduly and falsly chargeth upon others. 3. And yet this will in no wise advantage his cause: For we grant him that in reference to the inherent righteousnes of Sanctification men are called Righteous in the Scriptures by a personal righteousnesse. But what is this to that righteousnesse in our selves equally necessary to the righteousnes which is in Christ, to Justification, which he had in the former Theses asserted, and here goes about to prove or illustrate?

4. If he mean the rule of the New Covenant to Justification (which seems to me unquestionable, though hee will not so expres himself) then

1. I demand of him, how our actions relate to this rule? Is it that themselves, *i.e.* our very actions may be justified by it? This he condemneth, *Thess.* 25, and its Explication. Or that they may justifie us, as conditions of our Justification? This most probably is his meaning, which when he confesseth, he confesseth himself worse then Popish; for the Papists ascribe Justification no

actions indefinitely, but to ſome good works onely. When he peaks more broadly then they, let him ſhew himſelf without a izard under the name and motion of a Papiſt, and he will not want anſwerers or anſwers.

But upon this ſuppoſition let us ſee what he inferreth; *So all he regenerate are perſonally righteous, becauſe they all performe the onditions of this Covenant, and are properly pronounced righteous hereby.* Let us now collect together what in probability is the whole ſumme of his diſpute. Leaving what he hath ſaid to deny that men ere called Righteous in reſpect of Juſtification, by he rule of the Law, becauſe wee doe not, cannot perform the onditions of the Law (unto which I have already anſwered) ere e endeavours to prove, that they are called Righteous onely in eference to the rule of the Goſpel; and if we draw his reaſoning into a ſyllogiſm, it runs thus.

All that perform the conditions which the Goſpel, or New Covenant preſcribe unto Juſtification, are perſonally righteous hereby, and properly ſo called.

But all the Regenerate perform the conditions which the Gopel, or New Covenant preſcribe unto Juſtification.

Ergo, All the Regenerate are perſonally righteous, and properly ſo called thereby.

If Mr. *Baxter* ſaith not this, either he ſaith nothing, or I unerſtand nothing of what he ſaith. But it this be his meaning, hen as to his Propoſition or *Major*,

1. I except againſt the ambiguity of the termes, they want xplication. What he means by conditions, I know not; for if wee grant one, yet ſhall wee grant but one Goſpel condition of uſtification, *viz.* Faith in Chriſt Jeſus. When therefore he puts he plural number for the ſingular, untill he ſhall certifie us what e meaneth, we muſt leave him uncertain what wee will anſwer. gain, it is doubtful what he meaneth by *perſonally Righteous*: f he mean thereby the ſame thing with that which our Diines call *inherently Righteous*, and put in oppoſition to imuted righteouſneſſe, we deny the propoſition as falſe and Poiſh. But if he means by perſonal righteouſneſſe the Juſtification f our perſons by the blood of Chriſt apprehended by Faith, we ainſay not his propoſition, but pronounce it to be utterly beides his purpoſe, which is to prove a twofold righteouſneſs, ne in our ſelves, the other in Chriſt neceſſary to ſalvation. Yet

that this is not, but the former is his meaning, he makes evident by the word [*thereby*] *i. e.* by such performance. And if righteous by his owne workes and performance, hee needs not to step further to Christ for another righteousnes, to make him more then righteous, exorbitantly righteous, righteous in a way of supererogation. He that hath justified himself, needs no other Justifier. *Christ came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.*

As to the Assumption, or *minor* Proposition, I except that it labours of the same ambiguity in the word [*conditions*] with the *major*, so that untill hee tell us how many thousand, and what conditions he meaneth, I must be dumb instead of answering.

To both Propositions, I except that there lyeth a fallacie in the word [*perform.*] No living person can *perform* any thing so as to be justified, and bee termed absolutely righteous by such performing. Yet every Regenerate man doth *perform* that upon which he may rest confident that Christ is made of God Righteousnes to him, and so have his Justification evidenced to his own conscience. But if Mr. *Baxter* will change his termes, and call (after the tone of Scriptures, and Orthodox Writers) Christ our New Covenant or New Gospel righteousnes, and our *performings* or works, our legall righteousnes, then lo how neare he shall close with him. I shall say with him, that all which *perform* are righteous; but in what sense? Righteous in a proportion answering the proportion of their performings; if they perform perfectly, then perfectly righteous; if unperfectly, and sinfully, then sinfully, and unperfectly righteous. Whatsoever else Mr. *Baxter* would hence elicite, in doing it hee prostitutes all his integrity to sophistry and fallacies. The rest hath been said, and answered before, in, and upon the former clauses of this Explication.

Yet as if he had spoken all this out of *Peters* chair, which is as free from errors as an Irish cabbin from Lice, so he holds forth his golden foot triumphantly to tread on their necks, as being all laid prostrate before him, whosoever have since the beginning of the world, said any thing contrary to this doctrine which he hath brought to light now at the end of the world. Thus disdainfully exulting over them.

Bax. *pag.* 121. *Two sorts among us therefore discover intolerable ignorance in this point.* 1. *Those that commonly use and understand the words* [Righteous, *and* Righteousness] *as they relate to the old Rule; as if the godly were called righteous (besides their imputed righteousnesse) onely because their sanctification, and good works have some unperfect agreement to the Law of works; as if it were a streight line which is in one place streight, and in another crooked; much lesse that which is in every place crooked in some degree. I have been sorry to hear many learned Teachers speak thus.*

In these words wee finde first gross contradiction, whom he accuseth in one breath of intollerable *ignorance*, in the next breath he applaudes to be *learned Teachers*. If intollerably ignorant, how learned Teachers? If learned Teachers, how intollerably ignorant? Doth hee not contradict himself? unlesse hee will thus solve it. That in comparison with others they are learned Teachers, but as compared with himself, they are intollerably ignorant. This indeed is implyed in the next words, compassing the learned Teachers, *I have been sorry to hear many learned Teachers speak.* Others that were taken for learned saw no infirmity in them, *But I have been sorry to take notice of their nakednes, and babishnes in learning.* So doth the light of Moon and Starres vanish before the Sunne. Let us next take notice whom hee calleth intollerably ignorant, and for what.

1. Those that commonly use, and understand the words, *&c. ut suprà.* The Crab-fish cannot, will not cease to goe sideling, and crooked, though his damme intreate him to take streight steps. Can Mr. *Baxter* in a case of this nature deale simply, and sincerely? Shall we conclude (becaus hee saith it) that many *intollerably ignorant learned Teachers* have said, and maintained, that the *Godly* are [in Scriptures] called *Righteous* (besides their imputed righteousnes) *Onely* becaus their Sanctification and good works have some imperfect agreement to the Law of works, *Credat Judæus Apelles*, or *Quærat peregrinum*: I am too much acquainted with his fallacies and falsifications to beleeve it. It were a meer contradiction, for how that should bee called *Sanctification* which hath *onely* some imperfect agreement with the Law of Works, I see not; I never met with that man that

hath professed himself to have seen. We doe not place Sanctification in some outside conformity of the utter man, and his visible works *onely* to the Letter of the Law, but in the actuall infusion of the Holyness and Righteousnesse of the Law into mans heart, working a reall change of the whole man from the image of Satan, unto the image of God. Whom the Lord Jesus hath justified, and by his blood reconciled to God, so changing their relations: Them also he sanctifieth by his Spirit, and reformes to the image of God by the alteration of their qualities, which though it be but inchoate and unperfect at the first, yet in it more and more consummate and perfited untill the day of the Lord Christ. So that here is not *onely* the Law without, to rule and direct, but the holyness and righteousness of the Law, and Christ by his Spirit as the root thereof, wrought by Gospel grace in the heart, and diffused through the whole life; and the same conformed not onely to the Law, but the Gospel also, as before hath been mentioned. In respect of this sanctification, though yet but unperfect, wee indeed affirme the godly to be sometimes called Righteous, yet not righteous to Justification, but in regard of the life of Righteousnesse new begotten and inherent in them.

But it is observable how subtlely he slanders the Orthodox Teachers, with a fault which is his, not theirs, how hee would condemn them for men, attributing too much to the Law and Workes, because they call those virtues, and good works which the Law commandeth, a righteousnesse with which the godly do serve the Lord, in, and through Christ Jesus. When himself affirmes the same to be the very *Righteousnesse* by which they are justified. For if he be demanded whether the personall Righteousnesse which he contendeth to bee necessary and effectual to Justification, ought not to have at least some *unperfect agreement to the Law of God*, he answers affirmatively, and fights strongly for it in the sequele of this Treatise. Let him be demanded whether any other supposed Righteousnesse that the Law commands not, can be our personal righteousnesse to justifie us? This hee denyeth. What then is the difference betwixt him and them? This onely, that they will not say with him, that his righteousnesse (so unperfect as hee here termes it, and which in the last words of the former Section he pronounced *unrighteous, hatefull, and accursed*) is the personall righteousnesse by which men

en are juſtified before God. If you ask how ſuch workes ſhould ſtifie, being ſo unrighteous and accurſed? yes, ſaith he, as God th appointed them to be the conditions of the New Covenant, e performance whereof juſtifieth and maketh us perſonally ghteous before God. Here now is a heavenly Goſpel. Such nditions and ſuch a juſtification, if the one bee accurſed much ore the other. And where is Gods Righteouſneſs, if hee will t juſtifie but upon accurſed conditions?

Thoſe that will not, have not conſented to this doctrine of his; calls *intolerably ignorant.* Let him now name any one either vine, or underſtanding Chriſtian in any of the Churches that ve ſhook off Popery, and not ſuckt it back again, conſenting th him in this doctrine; elſe it is not his humility that is diſ-vered, in calling all the godly and learned that are, or have been any of the Churches of Chriſt, *intolerably ignorant. Satis pro perio*, enough Magiſterially out of doubt.

What he talks of the *ſtreight, crooked line*, hath its dependence ely upon the fallacious definition which hee before gave of ighteouſneſs, making it a mear empty notion, not a vertue or f of Gods grace; which definition falling, this compariſon fals th it. For if we grant unto Righteouſneſs a real being, Maſter xter himſelf will not deny but, as one ſparke of fire under a ſt heap of aſhes is as true and real fire as if no aſhes were there; one ſpark of righteouſneſs, (I mean living Righteouſneſs) der a whole body of infirmities, is as true and truly Righte-ſneſs as if no infirmities were there; And if God vouchſafe call a man righteous in reference to that poor pittance of ighteouſneſs, rather than unrighteous for the whole maſs of s corruptions: *what art thou O man that repliеſt againſt God? thine eye evil becauſe he is good?*

B. *Moſt they ſay to maintain it, is in this ſimple objection. If we are called holy becauſe of an unperfect holineſſe, then why not Righteous, becauſe of an imperfect righteouſneſſe?*

Anſw. *Holineſſe ſignifieth no more but a dedication to God, either by ſeparation onely, or by qualifying the ſubject, firſt with an aptitude to its Divine employment, and then ſeparating, or devoting it: as in our ſanctification. Now a perſon imperfectly ſo qualified, is yet truly and really ſo qualified. And thereforemay truly be called Holy ſo farre.*

But Righteouſneſſe ſignifying a conformity to the rule, and conformity with a quatenus, an imperfect rectitude, being not a true conformity or rectitude at all, (becauſe the denomination is of the whole action or perſon, and not of a certain part, or reſpect) therefore imperfect Righteouſneſſe is no Righteouſneſſe, but unrighteouſneſſe: It is a contradiction in adjecto.

Object. *But, is our perſonal Righteouſneſſe perfect, and is meaſured by the New rule?*

Anſw. *Yes: as I ſhall open to you by and by.*

I could here heap up a multitude of orthodox writers that do call our perſonal Righteouſneſſe by the title of (evangelicall) as ſignifying from what rule it doth receive its name.

The words of the Poet are here verified by Maſter *Baxter*, *malos bonos eſſe volunt, ut ſint ſui ſimiles.* Hee is angry with the ſimplicity of the godly and orthodox that they are ſingle and ſincere in their diſputes, and would have them double and crafty like himſelfe. In this ſenſe I acknowledge the Argument which he ſaith they bring, and ſo moſt they ſay to maintain their aſſertion, is a ſimple objection. They have more to ſay for the maintenance thereof then all his ſophiſtry can ſubvert. And this argument though ſimple, yet is not ſilly or weak, but ſtrong and ſound againſt all his batteries. It is drawn *à pari.* If there be parity between righteouſneſſe and holineſſe to give a denomination of holy and righteous perſons, then the argument is firme, and men may be as properly termed Righteous in reference to righteousneſſe not yet perfected, as holy in reference to a holineſſe not perfected: *at verum prius, ergo & Poſterius.* The former is true, therefore the latter alſo. Maſter *Baxter* denyeth the aſſumption, and goes about to ſhew a diſparity in this caſe between righteouſneſſe and holineſſe: making holineſſe to be either only a ſeparation of a thing or perſon to holy uſe, without an infuſion of a new qualification to fit him for holy employment, or at leaſt the qualification of ſuch a perſon firſt alway, and then aſparating of him afterward, as if uſually the conſecration or ſeparation by the blood, did not go before the new qualifying of him by the Spirit of Chriſt, (this indeed is not ſo ſquaring with the Popiſh Canon, as his way.) But to let paſſe this, & touch only upon that wherein he oppoſeth righteouſneſſe to holineſſe. Ho-

lineſſe

neſſe he grants to be a qualification, and conſequently to have a al Being. This here he denyeth, as before, of righteouſneſſe, meerly fallacious evaſion; for righteouſneſſe hath no leſſe a al being than holineſſe (as hath been before ſhewed.) And the cripture gives its Teſtimony, making *Righteouſneſſe and true olineſſe, as it were the two eſſentials of the New Man, which is eated after God*, i. e. in anſwer and conformity to *that eſſentiall ighteouſneſſe and Holineſs that are in God himſelfe*. Eph. 4. 24. nd what els doth Saint *Peter* mean in affirming the Saints to be *artakers of the Divine Nature*, but by the infuſion or creating of ighteouſneſſe as well as Holineſſe in them, by which they are formed to the nature of God, which is Holineſs and Righteouſneſs, 2 *Pet.* 1. 4. And no more is it a true Holineſs, than this rue Righteouſneſs which are not both in ſome meaſure conformed to the Law of God. And becauſe they are both alike al beings, or qualifications: Therefore what Maſter *Baxter* ſaith Holineſs may be no leſſe truly ſaid of Righteouſneſs alſo. hat a perſon imperfectly ſo qualified, is yet truly and really ſo ualified, and therefore may truly be called Righteous ſo farre. hat he doth *Philoſophari* to the contrary of Righteouſneſs, is ainſt both Philoſophy and Divinity, as hath been before maſfeſted.

When he hath once opened the perfection of this Righteouſneſs according to the new rule: we ſhall there and then examine as in its due time and place.

Let him name but one of the heap and multitude of thoſe Orthodox writers, that call our Perſonal Righteouſneſs [Evangelicall] in his ſenſe, elſe let him give us leave to conclude, that hee akes no conſcience of heaping together falſities in multitudes Ecclipſe the truth. But who are in his account Orthodox riters, though he doth not expreſsly tell us, yet he hath made eaſy for us to judge.

So farre of the former ſort of intolerably ignorant, *viz.* the arned teachers. He proceeds to the latter.

Bax. *pag.* 123. *The ſecond ſort that ſhew their groſs ignorance, of the nature of righteouſneſs, are the* Antinomians (*and ſome other ſimple ones whom they have miſled*) *who if they doe but hear a man talke of a righteouſneſs in himſelfe; or in any thing he can doe, or making his own duty either*

either his righteousnes, or conducible thereto; they start at such Doctrine, and even gnash the teeth, as if we preached flat Popery, yea as if we cryed down Christ, and set up our selves: The ignorant wretches not understanding the difference between the two sorts of Righteousnes: That of the Old Covenant, which is all out of us in Christ, and that of the New Covenant, which is all out of Christ in ourselves (though wrought by the power of the Spirit of Christ.)

In this, and that which followes, there is nothing but dirt and wind, all unworthy of the labour to transcribe it, much lesse deserving an answer to bee given it. I should therefore have past it by with disdainfull silence, were it not for the respect which I have to the weakest sort of Readers, who ordinarily are more affrighted with high and bragging words then wrought upon by sound reasons from the Word of God. For preventing of deluſion to such, I shall therefore say somewhat, and there will not bee need that I should say much.

First then I undertake to maintaine, that although there be no man upon earth that hath in words pretended more hatred and zeale against *Antinomians*, then Mr. *Baxter*, to make them hatefull to such as are fooliſhly apt to hate without a cauſe; yet is there no other man upon earth that hath in reality and substance so much honoured and magnified them as Mr. *Baxter*. He makes them, even them alone to be the sound Christians, the advancers and maintainers of the pure Gospel of Christ against all the falsities and portentous lyes of Antichrist, rayling against them as the onely hinderers of the total ruine of Christs Kingdom, and the advancing of the Kingdome of Antichrist in the room thereof as Paramount. These he affirms here to be the men superemineently zealous for Christ, who if they doe but hear a man talke of a righteousnes in himself, or any thing that he can doe (*viz.* as ordained, or powerful to justifie; for so is his meaning, or else he saith nothing) or maketh his own duty either his (Justifying) Righteousnes, or conducible thereto; they start, *&c.* as if we preached *&c. ut suprà.*

O noble spirits! these are the men indeed (as farre as we can judge) baptized with the Holy Ghost, and with fire. Let me not live one moment longer then the Grace of Christ suppor-

e in ſuch Antinomianiſm. Such have been all the holy Or-
odox Reformers, Martyrs, Teachers, and Saints, in all the
hurches from *Luther* unto this very day, ſuch were the Apoſtles.
t them be accurſed that preach another Goſpel; I would they
ere cut off that pervert this Goſpel, ſaith the Apoſtle. Theſe
are at once Anathematized by Mr. *Baxter* for Heretícks, for
ring to be bold in ſpeaking for Chriſt, when himſelf is impu-
nt to ſpeak for Antichriſt. But tuſh, all theſe were but the An-
ls of the Churches, this man is mounted higher, to take the
hair among the Seraphims, or Seraphicall Doctors: Therefore
ttieth the childiſhneſſe of this lower order, that they have not
ore ſublime apprehenſions. The ignorant wretches (ſaith hee)
t underſtanding the difference between the two ſorts of Righ-
ouſneſſe, that of the Old Covenant, which is all out of us in
hriſt, and that of the New Covenant, which is all out of Chriſt
our ſelves. Oh intolerable ignorance of all the worthies that
ve lived in all ages ever ſince God had a Church upon earth,
triarchs, Prophets, Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, Paſtors, and Teachers,
at none of all theſe could ſee that which never was, never ſhall
! Yea the moſt holy Father, Chriſts Vicar, with all his Cattell,
ardinals, Biſhops, Schoolmen, Monks, and Jeſuits, could but
nn it a diſtance unperfectly, untill Mr. *Baxter* (*Cui meliore Lu-
finxit præcordia Titan*) having lighted his Torch from him that
l as Lightning from heaven, brings it here as cleare and viſible
the man in the Moon to our view. What *Lyncean* eyes hath
! one of *Platoes* ſcholars no doubt, that had higher ſpeculations
en others, and could ſee *Ideaes*, which this man hath diſcerned
ore clearly then all his elder brethren that have ſtudied, and
en ſpent themſelves in the contemplatioa of them. But let us
ve the man, *Narciſſus* like, in his amorous doting on his beau-
and righteouſneſs, while wee preſent our ſelves before the
rd, *who is preſent only in Chriſt, reconciling the world to himſelf.*
The objection about *Ahab* and *Nineveh*, and the anſwer thereto
ven, wherwith the Explication of this *Theſis* is cloſed up, I paſs
as altogether impertinent to this queſtion of Juſtification by
r own perſonal righteouſnes; except either the Objector or the
nſwerer, *i. e.* Mr. *Ri.* or Mr. *Baxter* wil ſay, that either *Ahab* or
oſe *Ninevites*, were ever truly juſtified.

Chap. XVI.

Whether Faith in its proper sense, or [*in Mr.* Baxters *sense*] *the* τὸ credere, *i.e. Beleeving as it is an act, or worke of man, and comprehends in it all duties, be it self, our righteousness? or be imputed to us for Righteousnesse to Justification, or both? Mr.* Baxters *Reasons brought to prove the affirmative of all these, examined.*

Thesis 23. *page* 125.

Bax. *In this sense also it is so farre from being an Error to affirm that* (*Faith it self is our righteousnes*) *that it is a truth necessary for every Christian to know*, i.e. *Faith is our Evangelical Righteousnes* (*in the sense before explained*) *as Christ is our legall Righteousnes.*

Explication.

This assertion, so odious to those that understand not the grounds, is yet so clear from what is sayd before, that I need no more to prove it. For first I have cleared before that there must be a personall righteousnesse besides that imputed, in all that are justified. And that secondly, the fulfilling of the conditions of each Covenant, is our Righteousnesse in reference to that Covenant. But Faith is the fulfilling of the conditions of the New Covenant; therefore it is righteousnesse in relation to that Covenant. I do not here take Faith for any our single act, but as I shall afterward explain it.

Mr. *Baxter* verifieth the Proverb, *Noscitur ex comite, qui cognoscitur ex se.* The affections of the man may bee discerned by his company, with whom he is (as it were) in a confederacy. The Holy Ghost pronounceth of the Jews once degenerated into the manners, and false-worships of the *Canaanits*, that they were [no more children of *Abraham*, but that] *their birth was of the land of Canaan, their father was an Amorite, their mother a Hittite*, when once they had taken the pattern of their Religion

rom the *Amorites* and *Hittites*, and diverted from the Word of God, and ſteps of their own Progenitors, *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *acob*, and the following Patriarcks, and Prophets, *Ezek.* 16. . What ſhould we account leſſe of Mr. *Baxter*, whom wee finde eriving his Religion from the Papiſts, and their aſſociates the rminians, in contempt of Scriptures, and the godly Divines of he Reformed Churches?

His former aſſertions, *That beleevers are ſtill under the curſe f the Law after they are in Chriſt: That their Juſtification is but nditionall both before, and after their believing: That none is in any ſenſe) juſtified before he believeth: That Juſtification is a ntinued act, during onely ſo long as we continue fulfilling, broken when we break, and repaired when we return to the fulfilling a- ain of the ſuppoſed conditions thereof. That it is not compleated be- re the end of our life* (or as Mr. *Baxter*, out-ſtripping moſt of is Maſters, will have it) *not before the day of Judgement.* (Theſe l) hee cannot deny to be Doctrines held in common by the Je- its and Arminians; and I could (were there need) alleage e very words of *Bellarmine*, and other Jeſuits, and of *Armi- us, Corvinus, Epiſcopius, Grevinchovius*, the Apology of the Re- onſtrants, and in moſt of theſe even *Socinus* himſelfe, whoſe ot onely matter but alſo their very words Mr. *Baxter* hath anſcribed into our language, in the delivery of thoſe Te- nts.

Here againe hee doth in this Theſis lay downe a concluſion before more then hinted at) wherein *Bellarmine*, *Socinus*, and *rminius* fully agree; that, *Faith is our righteouſneſſe, even Faith ſelf our Evangelicall righteouſneſſe* (*viz. to Juſtification*) *that is ſo far from being an error to affirm it, that it is a truth neceſſary r every Chriſtian to know.* He acknowledgeth it in the Explication be *an aſſertion odious to ſome.* Rational men would therefore ſpect great ſtrength of Arguments to prove it. And what brings e? Nothing but his own Authority, which to us is of equal, d but of equal authority with theirs from whom hee hath ken it up. *It is clear* (ſaith he) *from what is ſaid before.* No ſe clear I acknowledge, then the face of a man in a mud-wall r a Looking-glaſſe. 1. *I have cleared before* (ſaith he) *beſides at imputed, that there muſt be alſo a perſonall Righteouſneſs in that are juſtified.* This is not denyed, that there muſt bee ſuch

a perſonall Righteouſneſſe, but that where it is, it is there pu per and effectuall to Juſtification, is no better cleared then h been ſaid. How the ſecond thing was before cleared by hi I referre to that which hath been ſaid of both ſides about it. the caſting of duſt and dirt into the eyes, may be properly call clearing of them; in this, and in no other ſenſe, doe I ackno ledge the thing to bee cleared by what Mr. *Baxter* hath bef ſaid.

Where he laies down this caution, (*I doe not here take Fa for any one ſingle act, but as I ſhall afterward explain it*) he mig have ſpared the labour to tell us ſo: For wee ſee what himſ ſeeth, that ſo to take it, would bee a ruinating blow to the m of the foregoing and following doctrines about Juſtificatio conteined in this his book.

But he goeth forward thus.

B. *Quæſt. In what ſenſe is then Faith ſaid to be impu to us for Righteouſneſſe, if it be our Righteouſneſſ ſelf?*

Anſw. *Plainly thus. Man is become unrighteous by bre ing the Law of Righteouſneſſe that was given him. Ch fully ſatisfieth for this tranſgreſſion, and buyeth the priſo into his own hands; and maketh with them a New Co nant: That whoſoever will accept of him, and bele in him who hath thus ſatisfied, it ſhall be as effectuall f their Juſtification, as if they had fulfilled the Law of Wo themſelves.*

A Tenant forfeiteth his Leaſe to his Landlord by paying his Rent: he runnes deep in debt to him, and diſabled to pay him any more Rent for the future. Whe upon he is put out of his houſe, and caſt into priſon till h pay the debt. His Landlords ſonne payeth it for him, take him out of priſon, and putteth him in his houſe again a Tenant, having purchaſed houſe and all to himſelf: maketh him a new Leaſe in this Tenor, that paying h Pepper-corn yearly to him, he ſhall be acquit both from h debt, and from all other Rent for the future, which by h old Leaſe was to be payed. Yet doth he not cancell the Leaſe, but keepeth it in his hands, to put it in ſuit ag

the Tenant, if he ſhould be ſo fooliſh as to deny the payment of the pepper-corn. In this caſe the payment of the grain of pepper is imputed to the tenant, as if he had payed the rent of the old Leaſe. Yet this imputation doth not extoll the pepper corn, nor vilifie the benefit of his benefactor, who redeemed him. Nor can it be ſayd that the purchaſe did onely ſerve to advance the value and efficacy of that graine of pepper. But thus, a perſonall Rent muſt be payd for the teſtification of his homage. He was never redemeed to be independent, and his own Land-lord and Maſter. The old Rent he cannot pay. His new Land-lords clemency is ſuch, that he hath reſolved this grain ſhall ſerve the turn.

Doe I need to apply this to the preſent caſe? or cannot every man apply it? Even ſo is our Evangelicall Righteouſneſs or Faith imputed to us for as real Righteouſnes, as perfect obedience. Two things are conſiderable in the debt of Righteouſneſs. The value, and the perſonall performance, and intereſt. The value of Chriſts ſatisfaction is imputed to us inſtead of the value of a perfect obedience of our own performing; and the value of our Faith is not ſo imputed. But becauſe there muſt be ſome perſonal performance of homage, therefore the perſonall performance of Faith ſhall be imputed to us for a ſufficient perſonall payment; as if we had payed the full rent; becauſe Chriſt, whom we believe in, hath paid it; and he will take this for ſatisfactory homage. So it is in point of perſonall performance, and not of value that Faith is imputed.

I ſhould have left this paſſage, as meerly windy, to the wind, nding nothing in it that hath the leaſt force to diſturb, or ſhake ny wel-grounded Chriſtian. Only becauſe not all that are true hriſtians, are alſo ſo well grounded and rooted in Chriſt, and uilt upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets as could e deſired; but not a few *children in underſtanding whirled to and o with every winde of doctrine*; for prevention of their ſliding ſhall ſay ſomething, (and there is not much need of ſpeaking uch) to it. Mr: *Baxter* ſhews himſelf to be a notable proficint, yea a perfitiſt in the art of Impoſture. As hee hath his feats nd ſhifts of ſophiſtry ſtill in readineſs to beguile them that pre-

tend to learning; ſo he hath, and here makes uſe of his *gay words and fair ſpeeches*, ſmoothneſſe of language, and a ſhew without ſubſtance of reaſon, which the Holy Ghoſt affirms to be the common ſlight of falſe teachers, *to deceive the hearts of the ſimple*, Rom. 16. 17, 18.

His ſcope here ſeemes to be two-fold. 1. To hold himſelfe in favour with the Arminians his younger brothers, and kindly to draw them with him up to a full cloſure with the Papiſts, the worſt of Papiſts, to ſpeak not onely the ſame thing, but alſo the ſame words with him, and them in the point of Juſtification. 2. To delude and charme with golden words of painted vanity, in ſtead of ſound verity, the weak and unwary Chriſtians among us, into a confederacy with him in his opinions. 1. In reference to the former part of his aim and purpoſe, it is evident, that though the *Arminians* are led by the ſame ſpirit with the Papiſts, and as much as we can underſtand by their writings, have even ſacrificed themſelves to drive on the Papiſts intereſts; yet they ſpeak not altogether ſo broad and home as Maſter *Baxter* doth in the Popiſh dialect in this point of juſtification. The times of Maſter *Baxters* and *Arminius* his declaring themſelves for the Popiſh ſynagogue, were not one and the ſame. Here Maſter *Baxter* hath the advantage of *Arminius*, & improves it diligently. *Arminius* was to broach his doctrine in a Common-wealth where he knew he ſhould have all the Magiſtracy, Miniſtry and people alſo, on a ſudden, riſing up with co-united ſtrength to oppoſe him; yea all the Magiſtrates and Miniſters of the reformed Churches round about, bringing their co-united help to extinguiſh his wild-fire. Needfull was it therefore for him in policy to ſpeak warily, *& non repente fieri turpiſſimus*: not at once to diſcover himſelfe at the worſt.

The times do better ſerve Maſter *Baxters* purpoſes, Providence hath caſt him upon a people of itching ears, at a time when the promoting and admitting of Monſtroſities in opinions is the faſhion mainly in requeſt in religion, the moſt, like the *Athenians*, harkening after nothing elſe but *news* and *novelties* in doctrine, & having ſet up Altars in their hearts *to the unknown God*, are ready to burn incenſe and offer ſacrifice to every phantaſm of falſhood, which under the name of a new light or truth, ſhall be diſcovered to them. It behoved him therefore, for the full attaining

ining of his deſigns, to make uſe of the opportunity, to ſtrike ome, and to the purpoſe, while the iron is hot, and having is mouth once open, to vomit out all the *poyſon* in his belly in ne flood, while there are ſo many mouthes and bellies open to eceive it. Hence it is, that *Arminius* and his followers, though ney had as good ſtomacks as Mr. *Baxter*, yet did not open their outhes as wide as hee in Babel language. Though they ſpake he *tantundem*, yet they ſpared to utter the *idem*, with the Papiſts to obſcure the Grace of God in our Juſtification. They ter-ed not (as the Papiſts do) *Faith the very, or part of the very righ-eouſneſs which juſtifieth of it ſelf*, but that which is imputed to us or, or inſtead of perfect righteouſneſs, to Juſtification, aſſert-ng not that it juſtifieth by its own inherent virtue, or righteouſ-eſs, but to bee graciouſly accepted for righteouſneſſe at Gods ribunall. *Chriſt* (ſay they) *hath merited for us, that our Faith ould be accepted, and eſteemed of God, for, and in place of the per-ect righteouſneſs of the Law, to juſtifie us in his ſight.* In ſubſtance hey ſpeak the ſame thing with, but in words they are ſomewhat nore favourable, and modeſt then the Jeſuits. But Mr. *Br.* doth ot thus ſpeak thorow his teeth liſping, to mince the matter, ut having the advantage of a good wind and tide, (as hath been aid) hoyſeth ſayles, and is at once carried into the very *Lateran* f *Rome*, through the ſtreams of *Tibris*; and ſpeakes out in the omiſh tone, aſſerting Faith to be the perſonall righteouſneſſe y which we are juſtified, and makes the righteouſneſs of Faith collateral with the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to our juſtification. et doubting his good friends the Arminians will be angry for is poſting before them, and finding them in reverence to their ather *Arminius*, yet ſticking to, and loath to depart from his ords, that Faith is but imputed for righteouſneſs, he calls back notwithſtanding all his haſte) to them, inviting them to follow im; for he is ſtill of the ſame mind with them, and endeavours o ſhew them, that Faith it ſelf may be our righteouſneſſe, and et be imputed to us for righteouſneſſe alſo. Which alſo he doth o graphically paint out to them, that they may (if they will not e too wayward) eaſily perceive, that they may own the Pope or their Father, and be nevertheleſs the genuine ſons of *Armi-ius* ſtill. What effect his fine words will take upon the Armi-ns, I know not, I care not. Only this was requiſite to be made ut to be one end that he had in this paſſage of his, that we might

the

the better know the man what he is: One that hangs ſo cloſe *Rome*, as the bur to the garment; yet holds ſweet correſpondenc with the *Arminians* too, to draw them to ſo full a diſcovery themſelves, as himſelf hath made of himſelf.

2. In reference to the weake, and unwary Chriſtians amo our ſelves, his aime is to faſten both the Popiſh and Armini doctrines before mentioned upon them; and that not by ſtron arguments of Scripture, whereof he is wholly deſtitute in th point, but by fine paints and flouriſhes of words, and delightf ſimilies, pretending much ſweetneſs and innocency in thoſe do ctrines, having learned of his forefathers that images are Laym beſt books, *viz.* to carry them into idolatry & error, and pictur are of more force to work upon the ignorant, then ſound do ctrine. To prevent therefore what evill is intended to them, ſhall give theſe few premunitions.

Firſt, that the queſtion it ſelf propoſed by him, is meerly cap tious; *If Faith be our Righteouſneſs it ſelf, how is it ſaid to be imp ted to us for Righteouſneſs?* as if Faith either as an act or duty, habit of Evangelical righteouſneſs, were imputed to us for, and i ſtead of the perfect fulfilling of the righteouſnes of the Law to ju ſtification. This he takes as granted, whereas it is one cheif thin in queſtion. All the reformed Churches, with their Teache & Paſtors have unanimouſly denyed both that faith is our juſtifi ing righteouſnes; and that it is imputed to us for righteouſnes, otherwiſe then as it is inſtrumental to apprehend Chriſt to be ou righteouſneſs, or the ſatisfaction which Chriſt hath made for u to be imputed to us, for, and inſtead of that righteouſnes which conſiſteth in fulfilling the Law.

2. As to the *plain* and poſitive *anſwer* which he makes to th queſtion: Though we grant what he ſaith of our unrighteouſ neſs, Chriſts ſatisfaction, and purchaſe of the priſoners; yet i that which hee addeth of the covenant that hee makes with th priſoners ſo bought, there is nothing but guilful, ambiguity. viz. that *Whoſoever will accept, and believe in him, who hath thus ſatisfi it ſhall be as effectual for their juſtification, as if they had fulfilled th Law of Works themſelves.* To the ſimple and upright man, that i not acquainted with Mr. *Baxters* ſubtilties, this will ſeem a ſound a Doctrine as if an Angel from heaven had delivered it. But how wide is his meaning from that which his words ſeem to import?

1. By

By faith he meaneth not what he calls it, *An accepting of and beleeving in Chriſt*, as it is ſuch an accepting and beleeving, but as it is a qualification or act, Comprehending in it all qualifications and good works beſides, as afterward he makes his meaning evident. When he calls it *an accepting of and beleeving in him* who hath thus ſatisfied, he means not a beleeving and accepting of him onely under this notion *as he hath ſatisfied*, that this ſhall ſuffice to Juſtification. Nay our accepting him for our law giver and performing of all things that he Commandeth, and Conſequently all our obedience, he will have to bear an equall part to Juſtification. 3 When he ſaith, *whoſoever thus acceipteth and beleeveth*, doth he mean that this Faith or beleeving is the alone Condition of the full juſtification of which he ſpeaketh, or upon which alone Chriſt Covenanteth to juſtifie? Nay he attributes no leſs to repentance, Charity, mercy, holines, every gift of the Spirit, every work of the law to which we are moved by the Spirit, and Called by the Goſpel; about their efficacy to Juſtification than to Faith it ſelf. Why doth he put off the Monkes Cowle and put on *Pauls* Cloke, onely to deceive the ſimple for whom Chriſt hath dyed? 4 When he ſaith, *It ſhall be as effectuall* &c. putting *It* next to the word *ſatisfied*, and next to the Clauſe *Him that hath ſatisfied*, there is the ſame ambiguity and falſhood with that which I noted in the ſecond place, and whether he meaneth *it* faith, or *it* ſatisfaction, ſhall do the work? 5 Where he ſaith, *It ſhall be as effectuall to Juſtification as if they had fulfilled the law of works themſelves.* Here he utterly deſtroyeth the righteouſneſs and ſatisfaction of Chriſt, as any way imputed to Juſtification, when elſwhere he makes it equally neceſſary with the righteouſneſs of Faith to Juſtification. And thus he ſeems to leave the Papiſts (which he would not do for a world I think) which hold that we are juſtified both by Chriſts righteouſneſs and our own righteouſnes alſo: and to joyn onely with the Socinians, which hold that we are juſtified onely by faith imputed to us for righteouſnes, and not by the righteouſneſs and ſatisfaction of Chriſt at all. For if this beleeving be by the vertue of Chriſts Covenant as effectuall to Juſtification as our fulfilling of the law of works could have been, then is there no need of any act or ſuffering or ſatisfaction of Chriſt to be imputed to us. For whoſoever ſhall fullfill the law ſhall have no need of a Mediator to juſtifie him. Therefore neither he that ſo beleeveth &c. But how hard is it for a man that oppugneth truth and propugneth error by meer fallacies againſt the light of his Conſcience, to

keep himself free from Contradictions; here he Contradicts what he had before said of Christ our righteousnes; and in the application of the following similitude we shall find him in substance contradicting what he here saith. Touching all those things which a little before I have affirmed his meaning to be so and so; let none demand how I know what is in another mans heart: himself in the following part of this Tractate fully discovers it, as we shall find by reading and examining it. Neither will any question it but they that have not read him, or in reading have not understood him. Thus much to his *plain answer* before he discends to his similitude which he useth as sugar to lap & roll it up in, that it may go down pleasantly. In this answer we finde nothing but words, his own words, not the least pittance of Gods word to authorize it; he saith all, and with the same facility we deny all. Proceed we after him now to his similitude.

3 As to his similitude, first I except that *Similitudines* or rather *Similia illustrant, non probant*. Similitudes are of good use to illustrate and make Cleer to the understanding that which is before proved to be a truth; but of no use to prove that which is unproved and the thing still in question. That which Mr. *Br* hath before Concluded in his answer, was that Faith is both the righteousnes it self by which we are justified, and 2 that it is also imputed to us for and instead of Justifying righteousnes: *viz.* the very Gospel Righteousnes imputed for and in stead of the legall righteousnes. He hath said it without any addittament of Scripture or reason to prove it; so that his similitude here is brought to illustrate onely a phantasm of his own brain, not any doctrine of Gods word.

2 I except against the similitude it self as being in its matter and form altogether incongruous to illustrate the doctrine of justification by Faith, which the Gospel holds forth to us; because it hath (besides other) these following incongruities to it.

1 Though (as in the positive answer before we did, so here) we grant what he saith of the Tenants forfeiture, unablenes to pay, expulsion from the inheritance, casting into prison; his Landlord's son paying the debt for him, delivering him out of prison, putting him into his house again as his Tenant, having purchased the house and all to himself; (provided alway that all this be done by the will of the Father the first Landlord, which Mr. *Br* doth not deny. And though we pardon to Mr. *Br* (upon Condition that he do it no more) that he speaks here more orthodoxly than he purposes

viz. the priſoners debt to be ſatisfied, the priſoner to be delivered, & reſtored to his houſe, to the inheritance again by the meer grace and purchaſe of the Son, before God; which implyes no leſs than a full juſtification with & by God, before ever the priſoner beleeved, or had a new Leaſe, a new Covenant of grace and faith made with him; a doctrine which before Mr. *Br* anathematizeth to hell it ſelf: and will do ſo again; though he thereby Curſe himſelf for that which inconſiderately here fell from him: Theſe things granted and winked at: we utterly explode all the reſt in the Similitude not onely as uncoherent with, but as contrary to the doctrine of Grace, yea utterly deſtructive to the nature and working of grace in our Juſtification; and that in theſe particulars, as I promiſed above to ſpecifie. 1 That it maketh our Juſtification mercenary, and held by yeerly rent: for though it be but a pepper-corn that is payd, yet that is rent and payment, (as ſhall be manifeſted before we paſſe from this ſimilitude) which is contrary to the Covenant of grace, and doctrine of the Goſpel which affirmeth, that *We are juſtified freely by his Grace through the Redemption which is in Jeſus Chriſt*, Rom. 3.24. And wholly agreeing with the doctrine of the Goſpel is that of *Auſtin*; *Non enim gratia Dei Gratia erit ullo modo, niſi gratuita ſit omni modo.* The Grace of God ſhall not be grace in any reſpect, except it be free in every reſpect. But how is it free which is a debt acquired and held by rent and payment? 2 That it maketh our Juſtification Conditionall, if Articles of Covenant be performed then the Tenant abides in the inheritance, the man is juſtified, if through fooliſhnes or forgetfulnes unperformed, then is the Tenant outted, the man unjuſtified. And to be thus conditionally Juſtified is no Juſtification. When contrariwiſe the Goſpel holds forth a reall and abſolute Juſtification, *Son, Daughter, Be of good cheare, thy ſinns be forgiven*, Mat. 9. 2. Luk. 7. 48. *He that is waſhed needeth not, ſave to waſh his feet, but is clean every whit*, Joh. 13. 10. *Being juſtified by faith, we have peace with God, and glory in tribulation*, Rom. 5. 1. 3. Is it not a reall and abſolute, but a conditionall forgivenes, waſhing, Juſtifying here ſpoken of? then muſt the effects in theſe places added and attributed to ſuch forgivenes waſhing & Juſtifying, be not reall but conditionall alſo. A conditionall not reall chear & comfort, a conditionall not reall cleanneſs, a conditionall not reall peace with God, and glorying in tribulation. But theſe effects are out of queſtion reall, Therefore Juſtification the Cauſe of theſe effects reall alſo. 3 It delineats an unperfect Juſtification. *The Old*

Leaſe is not cancelled, but kept firm to be put in ſuit againſt the Tenant after the New Leaſe is made. The Old Covenant of works is kept in force againſt the beleever after he is entred into the New Covenant of grace to be put in ſuit againſt him upon occaſion to his totall damnation. When the Goſpel pronounceth the juſtification of a beleever perfect, the Old Covenant in reſpect of any power over him to be *dead*, Rom. 7. 6. *The hand writing againſt him and contrary to him, blotted out, taken out of the way, and nailed to the Croſs of Chriſt*, Col. 2. 14. *So that he is no longer under the Law of works to be pleaded or putt in ſuit againſt him*, Rom. 6. 14. *Nor is there now any more Condemnation to be inflicted on him*, Rom. 8. 1. 4 It points out a mutable juſtification. While the Tenant payeth the rent he ſhall be acquit both from his debt and all other rent for the future, but if he miſs of payment then, both the old debt and rent falls on him as a mountain again, cruſhing him untill the pepper-corn intercede & remove the mountain, and then acquitt again untill the pepper-corn be loſt in carriage, or being round and full of volubility, run beſides the Landlords hand, then on comes the mountain of debt upon the Tenant again, &c. Thus mans juſtification is made faſt or looſe, according to the ſtedfaſtnes or mutableneſs of mans will, and the grace of God in juſtifying, of ſo little fixedneſs that a pepper-corn can weigh it and ſway it up and down at pleaſure. When contrariwiſe the Scripture every where pronounceth the grace of God, and Covenant of grace, everlaſting, unchangeable; and makes the Juſtification of man to reſt not upon his own mutable and mad will, but upon the ſtable and ſtabliſhing grace of God. *I will be mercifull to their unrighteouſneſs, and their ſinns and iniquities will I remember no more*, Heb. 8. 12. *I will make an everlaſting Covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them to do them good, but I will putt my fear in their hearts that they ſhall not depart from me*, Jer. 32. 40. with a large heap of teſtimonies more to the ſame purpoſe, which would be here impertinent to tranſcribe.

Thus is the ſimilitude as here framed in all theſe reſpects, proper indeed to illuſtrate the bugbear figment of Juſtification in Mr. *Brs* brain: but altogether incoherent with the Juſtification which the Goſpel holds forth to us. Yet he addeth, *In this caſe the payment of the grain of pepper is imputed to the Tenant as if he had payd the Rent of the old Leaſe.* When contrariwiſe the reformed Churches affirm from moſt full and pregnant Teſtimonies of Scripture, that to reſt any thing at all upon the imputation of ſuch pepper payments

ments for righteousnes, doth utterly frustrate the offers of grace and benefits of Christs death unto us; as hath been oft before manifested.

That which followeth doth not take off the Odium and falshood of this his doctrine, but rather augments it, declaring that he hath learned of the Papists not onely their falsifications of the Gospel, nullifying of the grace and righteousnes of God, and extolling the creſt of mans pride; but also their fallacious shifts to defend his dealing herein. Yet this imputation (saith he) *doth not extoll the pepper-corn, nor vilifie the benefit of his benefactor, who redeemed him; Nor can it be said that the purchase did onely serve to advance the value and efficacy of that grain of pepper.* The very language of the Papists and the Arminians, for so they when they have mounted the righteousnes of mans faith and works to be a part or the whole of the righteousnes effectuall to Justification; they come after with a plausible varnish of words, professing that they do not herein abase Gods grace, nor heave above its own proportion mans righteousnes. For (say they) we do not attribute any thing to mans righteousnes, either as it is mans righteousnes, or to the price and value of it, as if by its own worth & merit it doth Justifie; but partly (saith *Antoninus*) *ex ordinatione Divina*, as God hath ordeined it to that end; and *partly as it is the effect of Grace, and wrought in us by the Spirit, so that the value and efficacy thereof is to be taken not from the righteousnes inherent in us, or performed by us, but from Gods ordination of it to the end to which himself will make it effectuall, and from the vertue of Grace, and the spirit of grace in whose strength it is performed.* So also the rest of the Scholasticks, Monks and Jesuits, affirm that they do not by this doctrine Contribute any thing to mans righteousnes, or diminish the glory of Gods grace and Christs merits; Nay they are the sole advancers of Grace and of Christ; for that they attribute due power to them, to make mans righteousnes that is base and nothing in it self, to be effectuall or meritorious to Justification. That these *Heretikes the Lutherans* are the Cursed enemies unto Christ and grace, in denying our Righteousnes available to justifie and save us, so streightening the vertue and power of Grace and of Christ, as being unable to infuse vertue and efficacy into our righteousnes to justifie and save us, but more fully of this in a more proper place. The same paint doth *Arminius* use to make tolerable if not plausible his imputation of the Act of Faith to Justification, as his very words are alleaged by Mr. *Pemble*. No marvell then

Antoni. par. 4. tit. 9. c. 7. ante sect. & sect. 1, 2, 3. Osor de Just. li. 6. nu. 151 ex Hos. Confut. lib 5. pag. 451, 452. Andrad. Orthod. explic. li. 6. pag. 181. Pemb. of justif. p. 34, & 35. sect. 2. cap. 2.

Leaſe is not cancelled, but kept firm to be put in ſuit againſt the Tenant after the New Leaſe is made. The Old Covenant of works is kept in force againſt the beleever after he is entred into the New Covenant of grace to be put in ſuit againſt him upon occaſion to his totall damnation. When the Goſpel pronounceth the juſtification of a beleever perfect, the Old Covenant in reſpect of any power over him to be *dead*, Rom. 7. 6. *The hand writing againſt him and contrary to him, blotted out, taken out of the way, and nailed to the Croſs of Chriſt*, Col. 2. 14. *So that he is no longer under the Law of workes to be pleaded or putt in ſuit againſt him*, Rom. 6. 14. *Nor is there now any more Condemnation to be inflicted on him*, Rom. 8. 1. 4 It points out a mutable juſtification. While the Tenant payeth the rent he ſhall be acquit both from his debt and all other rent for the future, but if he miſs of payment then, both the old debt and rent falls on him as a mountain again, cruſhing him untill the pepper-corn intercede & remove the mountain, and then acquitt again untill the pepper-corn be loſt in carriage, or being round and full of volubility, run beſides the Landlords hand, then on comes the mountain of debt upon the Tenant again, &c. Thus mans juſtification is made faſt or looſe, according to the ſtedfaſtnes or mutableneſs of mans will, and the grace of God in juſtifying, of ſo little fixedneſs that a pepper-corn can weigh it and ſway it up and down at pleaſure. When contrariwiſe the Scripture every where pronounceth the grace of God, and Covenant of grace, everlaſting, unchangeable; and makes the Juſtification of man to reſt not upon his own mutable and mad will, but upon the ſtable and ſtabliſhing grace of God. *I will be mercifull to their unrighteouſneſs, and their ſinns and iniquities will I remember no more*, Heb. 8. 12. *I will make an everlaſting Covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them to do them good, but I will putt my fear in their hearts that they ſhall not depart from me*, Jer. 32. 40. with a large heap of teſtimonies more to the ſame purpoſe, which would be here impertinent to tranſcribe.

Thus is the ſimilitude as here framed in all theſe reſpects, proper indeed to illuſtrate the bugbear figment of Juſtification in Mr. *Brs* brain: but altogether incoherent with the Juſtification which the Goſpel holds forth to us. Yet he addeth, *In this caſe the payment of the grain of pepper is imputed to the Tenant as if he had payd the Rent of the old Leaſe.* When contrariwiſe the reformed Churches affirm from moſt full and pregnant Teſtimonies of Scripture, that to reſt any thing at all upon the imputation of ſuch pepper payments

ments for righteousnes, doth utterly frustrate the offers of grace nd benefits of Christs death unto us; as hath been oft before ma-ifested.

That which followeth doth not take off the Odium and falsood of this his doctrine, but rather augments it, declaring that e hath learned of the Papists not onely their falsifications of the Gospel, nullifying of the grace and righteousnes of God, and exolling the crest of mans pride; but also their fallacious shifts to d fend his dealing herein. Yet this imputation (saith he) *doth not extoll the pepper-corn, nor vilifie the benefit of his benefactor, who redeemed him; Nor can it be said that the purchase did onely serve to advance the value and efficacy of that grain of pepper.* The very language of the Papists and the Arminians, for so they when they have mounted the righteousnes of mans faith and works to be a part or the whole of he righteousnes effectuall to Justification; they come after with plausible varnish of words, professing that they do not herein abase Gods grace, nor heave above its own proportion mans righteousnes. For (say they) we do not attribute any thing to mans righteousnes, either as it is mans righteousnes, or to the price and alue of it, as if by its own worth & merit it doth Justifie; but partly (saith *Antoninus*) *ex ordinatione Divina*, as God hath ordeined it o that end; and *partly as it is the effect of Grace, and wrought in us by the Spirit, so that the value and efficacy thereof is to be taken not from the righteousnes inherent in us, or performed by us, but from Gods ordination of it o the end to which himself will make it effectuall, and from the vertue of race, and the spirit of grace in whose strength it is performed.* So also he rest of the Scholasticks, Monks and Jesuits, affirm that they do not by this doctrine Contribute any thing to mans righteousnes, r diminish the glory of Gods grace and Christs merits; Nay they re the sole advancers of Grace and of Christ; for that they attribute due power to them, to make mans righteousnes that is base nd nothing in it self, to be effectuall or meritorious to Justificatin. That these *Heretikes the Lutherans* are the Cursed enemies unto hrist and grace, in denying our Righteousnes available to justifie nd save us, so streightening the vertue and power of Grace and Christ, as being unable to infuse vertue and efficacy into our ghteousnes to justifie and save us, but more fully of this in a ore proper place. The same paint doth *Arminius* use to make torable if not plausible his imputation of the Act of Faith to Justiation, as his very words are alleaged by Mr. *Pemble*. No marvell then

Antoni. par. 4. tit. 9. c. 7. ante sect. & sect. 1, 2, 3. Osor de Just: li. 6. pag. 151 ex Hos. Confut. lib 5. pag. 451, 452. Andrad. Orthod. explic. li. 6. pag. 181. Pemb. of justif. p. 34. & 35. sect. 2. cap. 2.

then if Mr. *Br* hath proficiently learned at the feet of such G... *leels*. But what force or ſhew of ſubſtance is there in his and th... ſo peeviſh ſhifts and evaſions? It is as he that brake up a neigh... bours houſe, killed the Maſter and enriched himſelf with the Tre... ſure thereof, with this mentall reſervation, that the Act ſhould b... without any guilt of Murther before God, or of felony befo... men. And what either God or man could then lay any thing to h... Charge. So Mr. *Br* with thoſe whom he followeth, robs God o... the glory of his grace, and Chriſt of the honour of his merits, to e... rich the righteouſneſs of their own Faith and works therewith... but with this proviſo firſt layd in their fancies, and after ſubſcri... bed to with their hands, that God and his Chriſt muſt not ta... their grace and righteouſnes herein wronged, nor mans righteou... neſs extolled, nor the actors therein offenders: and when the... have layd all things ſo ſure, what hath God or man to ſay again... them?

Yet is there one inconvenience, and the ſame a ſhrewd one, th... Gods way of reckoning in the point of Juſtification was fixed be... fore this of Mr. *Br* and his Maſters, and without any Conſultation... with them about it, by means whereof it runs right Contrary t... theirs. And it is much to be feared becauſe he is God, he will no... now Change. He hath in this point ſet ſo in direct oppoſition man... righteouſneſs and Gods righteouſneſs, grace and works, that both... Cannot, ſhall not Conſiſt together, but either exclude and fruſtra... the other. It muſt be *onely Gods righteouſneſs or onely mans righteou... neſs* (according to his rule) by which we muſt be juſtified; he pro... hibits all medleyes, will have no mixture of heaven and of earth... of the Spirit and of the fleſh, the oxe and the aſſe muſt not be yoke... together in this buſines: he that brings any of his own righteou... neſs, fruſtrates to himſelf the Grace and righteouſneſs of God... He that truſteth to grace, and putts on by Faith the *righteouſneſs of God*, muſt *derelinquiſh his own righteouſneſs* to be found in Gods r... lone unto Juſtification, *Rom.* 9. 30, 31, 32. *Rom.* 10. 3, 4. *Phil.* 3... 9. *If by Grace, then it is no more of works, otherwiſe grace is no more... grace; but if it be of works, then it is no more grace, otherwiſe work... no more work*, Rom. 11. 6. And other ſuch like Scriptures which... in the more proper place I ſhall produce. What will Mr. *Br* an... ſwer at Gods tribunal for raiſing his pepper-corn as a mount from... which to batter the impregnable grace and righteouſneſs of God?... If this doth not, what can extoll his pepper-corn?

To

To conclude what I have to say to the foresaid words of Mr. r, let him not take pepper in the nose (as the Country phrase is) I take a grain or two of his own loose powder to blow up his epper-corn, that it may not be abusive to the feeble and simple Christians. If these will but consider well these two things; first, hat he means by his pepper-corn? secondly, how farr he will ex-ase, or extoll it, they should easily see his subtlety, and keep their oot from being taken in this his snare laid for them. Both these are o be gathered from himself. Touching the former he means by the epper-corn, the whole righteousness of man, the entire righte-usness which the Law requireth in the full substance, though not n the full degree which the Law requireth it, all personall vertues nd duties which the morall Law injoyned upon men. This is cleer nough by what he hath said before, hinted by that which he an-exeth in the application of this Similitude when he saith, *Even so r our Evangelicall Righteousness or Faith*, insinuating that by Faith e means all that Can be brought under the notion of Evangeli-all righteousness in his sense, which is all that the Law Com-nandeth and the Gospel approveth as righteousness: and in the ollowing part of his Treatise when he Comes to the Anatomizing f his Faith here spoken of, he doth in expres words affirm & seek o confirm it. Here is a pepper-corn able like *Moses* his rod-serpent, o eat up all the pepper-corns of the East-Indies. Possibly the roy-ll Soveraign was built to fetch it from the East Indies to us, it eing too great a fraught for any other Shipp in *England*. And it nust not be divided, for a peece will do no good in this busines, ut the whole is required. Doth not the weakest Christian here see discovered the Cunning of the man that would have them to swal-low such a pepper-corn, such a Camel into themselves? What room would be left then for Christ? which of the Pharisees of old or of the Papists in latter ages, have more extolled mans righte-ousness, or more fully ascribed salvation to works? onely though hey used terms equipollent to Cover their falshood, yet they did not hit upon the pepper-corn, to delude poor souls with an opi-nion that if there were any difference between their doctrine and he Doctrine of the Scriptures, yet was it as small as the weight nd worth of a pepper-corn; so that they might be followed with-out danger.

Touching the latter, how farr he will extoll the pepper-corn of our own workes and righteousness to Justification and salvation, he

he doth not here (though afterward he doth) in expreſs words ſignifie. But that he means to extoll them, he doth enough plainly give us to underſtand: When he ſaith that the purchaſe did not *Onely* ſerve to advance the value and efficacy of that grain of pepper, his meaning muſt be (at leaſt) that Chriſt dyed and by his death hath purchaſed to the pepper-corn of mans righteouſneſs, a value and efficacy in part, though not *Onely* to Juſtifie us, ſo that our righteouſneſs muſt go Cheek by Cheek with the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to Juſtification. Now as if Uſury as it Conſiſteth in taking increaſe, be unlawfull, a penny of a hundred pounds taken by way of increaſe, is no leſs in ſubſtance Uſury and unlawfull, than the taking of Tenn pounds of the hundred: ſo if the adding of our righteouſneſs to the righteouſneſs of Chriſt for our juſtification, be an unlawfull exalting of our own, and depreſſing of Chriſts righteouſneſs, then to bring our own righteouſneſs with the righteouſneſs of Chriſt in the leaſt part to juſtifie, is as truly an unlawfull depreſſion of Chriſts righteouſneſs and advancing of our own, as if we brought it in the higheſt degree wholly and alone to juſtifie us: and ſo by his account Chriſt dyed to make man, though not the *Onely*, yet in part a ſaviour of himſelf. And herein to follow his doctrine is the ready way to be a ſelf-deſtroyer. *Chriſt is become of none effect to you whoſoever of you are juſtified by the Law, ye are fallen from grace*, ſaid the Apoſtle to a people, that did extoll but in part and not *Onely* their own righteouſneſs to juſtification. Though it be not *Onely* poyſon which a man eateth, yet if there be poyſon in it, it brings death after it. If we magnifie one grain of our own pepper to that height that we make it a part of that righteouſneſs by which to ſtand at Gods tribunall this one grain will ſink us down to hell, ſo hot a poyſon is Mr. *Brs* pepper-corn.

I ſhall joyn that which followes in the ſimilitude, *viz.*

Bax. *But thus: A perſonall Rent muſt be payd for the teſtification of his homage: He was never Redeemed to be Independent, and his own Landlord and Maſter; The olde Rent he cannot pay, but his Landlords clemency is ſuch, that he hath reſolved, this grain ſhall ſerve the turn.*

With that which is homogeneous to it in the application.

Bax. *Two things are conſiderable in this debt of righteouſneſs: The value and the perſonall performance or intereſt. The value of Chriſts ſatisfaction is imputed to us, inſtead of the value of a perfect Obedience of our own performing; and the volue of our Faith*

is not so imputed: But because there must be some personall performance of homage, therefore the personall performance of Faith shall be imputed to us for a sufficient personall payment, as if we had payd the full Rent, because Christ whom we beleeve in, hath payd it, and he will take this for satisfactory homage; so it is in point of personall performance, and not of value, that faith is imputed.

It is not denyed but a personall testification of homage is required. We were not Redeemed to be independent, or our own Landlords and Masters, to serve our selves and walk after our own thoughts. No; *Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price,* (saith the Apostle) *Therefore glorifie God in your body and in your Spirit which are Gods,* 1 Cor. 6. 20. And again, *He hath given himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purifie to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.* We must live and dye to him that dyed for us in testification of our homage. But the thing in question is not whether this homage is to be done, but whether when it is performed, it be a Cause or an effect of our redemption and justification; Whether we are to perform all duty that we may be redeemed and justified, or because we are redeemed and justified. Whether the relation of the persons go before the relative duties, or the relative duties before the relation of the persons. Reason tells us that filiall obedience doth alway presuppose the relation of a Son, and where there is no Childe there can be expected no Childlike obedience. First free and then free service. And to this tenor runs the vote and voyce of the Gospel. *We are delivered out of the hands of our enemies, that we may serve him without fear, in holines and righteousnes before him all the dayes of our life,* Luk. 1. 74, 75. Not that we shall be delivered out of &c. because we have so served him all the dayes of our life. *That we are married to Christ, that we should bring forth fruit unto God,* Rom. 7. 4. Not that we are married to Christ, because we have brought forth fruit unto God. That *he dyed for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him that dyed for them,* 2 Cor. 5. 15. Not that we must live to Christ, that we may live by Christ and obtein life by his death. *If any man be in Christ he is a new creature,* 2 Cor. 5. 17. Not that he must be a new creature to the end that he may be in Christ. Mr. *Br* shakes the whole frame of the Gospel into a topsie-turnie, and might as rationally make our glorification the Condition of our sanctification, as sanctification the Condition of our Justification and Adoption.

As for the diſtinction which he puts in the application, between the value and the performance of Faith, *i.e.* (in his ſenſe) of ſanctification, making the value of Chriſts ſatisfaction to be imputed in ſtead of the value of a perfect obedience, and the perſonall performance of Faith to be imputed onely in ſtead of the perſonall performance of the Law, and ſo our inchoat ſanctification (for that he means by the performing of faith) is imputed to us in place of performing all perfect righteouſneſs, unto juſtification; ſome pretty witty men may be taken with it as a pretty witty fancy; But whoſoever Loveth the Lord Jeſus up to a due jealouſie for his honour, Cannot but have his heart full of trembling, to ſee the ſacred word and myſteries of Chriſt, to be made the play-game of an audacious and frothy wit, and eluded yea vilified and enervate, with ſuch abſurd and windy diſtinctions that have no footing in the word of God. Himſelf uſing this diſtinction with a purpoſe not to teach but to Cheat the ſimple. For *pag.* 141. he doth in expreſs words affirm *the worthines* or value (which he doth here aſcribe to Chriſts ſatisfaction) to lye in *our performance* or works. Either he muſt be deſtitute of all natural and moral *operations of Conſcience, or an Anti-Hannibal, that hath ſworn unreconcileable warrs, not for God againſt Rome, but for Rome againſt Chriſt*, that in ſo holy a buſines can ſo *frequently and fearleſly act the wanton.* I ſhall conclude therefore in the words which Mr. *Pemble* hath againſt the brethren of Mr. *Br* in this point. *Theſe things the Scriptures teach not; They teach that Chriſt is our righteouſnes, and that we are juſtified by his bloud and obedience. But that he hath merited by his obedience, that we ſhould be juſtified by our own Righteouſneſs and Obedience, is a perverſe aſſertion of men that love to run about the buſh, and leaving the ſtreight to run into crooked and froward wayes.* Like to theirs is Mr. *Brs* diſpute here, and no leſs than they deſerving the ſame cenſure. The Holy Ghoſt Calls upon us for a Faith to Juſtification, that Conſiſteth in taking and receiving, Mr. *Brs* diſtinctions for a Faith that Conſiſteth in dooing and performing: The Holy Ghoſt in the diſpenſation of Goſpel-grace ſaith; *Take Freely*, Rev. 22. 17. Mr. *Brs* diſtinction preſſeth upon us *to give all or we ſhall receive nothing:* The one ſaith, *Without money and without price*, *Iſa.* 55. 1. The other makes all our hopes to depend upon our payments and rents. How apparent is it that the ſpirit of bondage that ſpeaketh in Mr. *Br* is a Spirit of a contrary nature to the Spirit of Liberty that ſpeaketh in the Goſpel? He ſhould not abuſe the Scripture that ſhall ſay to Mr. *Br* what *Peter* ſaid to *Simon* the Magi-

Pembl. of Juſtif. ca. 2. pag. 41.

Magician, *Act.* 8. 20. *Thy money, thy pepper-corn periſh with thee, becauſe thou haſt thought that the gift of God may be purchaſed with money, with pepper-cornes.* But in ſtead of ſaying ſo againſt him, I ſhall pray for him.

CHAP. XVII.

That Popiſh Luciferian doctrine of the Perfection and Merits of mans inherent Righteouſneſs to Juſtification, here taught by Mr. Br. *examined. To which is added ſomething in anſwer to what he bringeth, about the Juſtification, firſt of the perſon and then of his works, and of the poſſibility of performing this perfect meritorious Righteouſneſs.*

Bax. Theſis 24. p. 129.

THis perſonall Goſpel Righteouſneſs is, in its kinde a perfect Righteouſneſs; and ſo far we may admit the doctrine of perſonall perfection.

Theſis 26. p. 137.

Neither can our performance of the conditions of the Goſpel, in the moſt proper and ſtrict ſenſe, be ſayd to merit the reward: ſeeing there is nothing in the value of it, or any benefit that God receiveth by it, which may ſo entitle it meritorious. Neither is there any proportion between it and the Reward. But in a larger ſenſe as promiſe is an obligation and the thing promiſed is called Debt, ſo the performers of the Condition are called worthy; and their performance merit, though properly it is all of Grace, and not of Debt, Rom. 4. 4, 10. & 5. 15, 16, 17. Hoſ. 14. 4. Mat. 10. 8. Rom. 3. 24. & 8. 32. 1 Cor. 2. 12. Rev. 21. 6. & 22. 18. Rom. 11. 6. Gal. 5. 4. Eph. 2. 5, 7, 8. Gen. 32. 10. Matth. 10. 11, 12, 13, 37. & 22. 8. Luk. 20. 35. & 21. 36. 2 Theſ. 1. 5. 11. Rev. 3. 4. &c.

I joyn theſe two together becauſe of their affinity either to other, and annex them to the former, *viz.* the 23 *Theſis*, becauſe of their dependance on it, ſtanding or falling with it; there being no new thing in ſubſtance, but in degrees onely, here aſſerted. In the 23 *Theſ.* he had aſſerted a perſonall Righteouſneſs of our own, neceſſary and effectuall to Juſtification: Here leaſt he ſhould ſeem a youn-

ger Brother to any of the Jeſuites, he mounts himſelf Cheek-mate with the worſt of them in his gradations, affirming that Righteouſneſs of our own to Juſtification, *Theſ.* 24. to be a perfect Righteouſneſs, and *Theſ.* 26. a *Meritorious Righteouſneſs*. Hath any of the moſt zealous Children of *Babylon* raiſed his ſcaffolds higher, to exalt the pinacles thereof to a more ſtupendous height?

There ſhall not be need of ſpeaking much by way of anſwer to him in theſe poſitions and their explications: For he doth here bnild Chimæra's upon Chimæra's, and nothings upon nothing. We deny, and ſo do all the true Churches of Chriſt, any ſuch perſonall Righteouſneſs of man, as righteouſneſs neceſſary or required to Juſtification, affirming that every imagination of ſuch righteouſneſs as effectuall or ordeined to juſtifie, is a monſter begotten of the pride of mens hearts, which in the midſt of all their gawdy knowledge, never experimentally knew Chriſt, or the operation of that juſtification which is by Chriſt alone, upon their Conſciences. Neither hath Mr *Br* brought any one reaſon worth a ruſh to prove ſuch a Righteouſneſs. So theſe two poſitions are anſwered in the laſt before it. There being no ſuch righteouſneſs: the blinde man may ſee that No righteouſneſs cannot be either a perfect or meritorious Righteouſneſs; The ſubject *Righteouſneſs* being evaporated, the accidents thereof [perfect and Meritorious] are turned to vapours with it. The Adjects ſtand not, where the ſubject is diſſolved. It can be but an imaginary dreſs that is put on upon a meerly imaginary body. Yet I ſhall look after Mr. *Br* in his imaginations, if peradventure there fall from him any thing here and there deſerving an animadverſion.

In the Explication of the 24 *Theſis* he ſpends two whole pages, *viz.* 130, 131, in ſpitting of wit, and playing with his imaginary perfection of perſonall Righteouſneſs unto Juſtification, as with a ſhuttle-cock, here I hit you, there I miſſed you, there you were mine, here I came ſhort of you; and when he hath taken his fill of this game, in the laſt line of *pag.* 131. and ſo forward in the next page, confeſſeth that all this is nothing to his meaning or purpoſe, [and yet is it full to it.] Nothing to his purpoſe or meaning, in reference to the explication much leſs to the proving of a perſonall righteouſneſs required to Juſtification, or a perfection of ſuch a righteouſneſs: yet full to his purpoſe to delight and allure to him ſuch as have nimble wits but dull Conſciences, how ſhould theſe but run after him finding more wit and art, in theſe two pages of his, than

ever

er they met with in all the doctrine of the dull Apostles and Pro-ets, though they should add to them their Master also.

Well, *Hæc non successit, alia aggrediamur via.* That which he hath d is not home to his meaning: But that which he saith next shall me home to it. And what saith he? *Nihil quod non dictum est prius* nely that which he had said before once and again. Holines is a ality, Righteousnes is not so, but the Modification of our Acts to the Rule, *viz.* to the Rule of the New Covenant in point of stification. Here is nothing but what was said before, and hath en answered before in our Examination of the Explication of the rmer *Thesis.* But he adds which is not varyed *secundum magis & inùs*, alleaging *Schibl. Metaph. li. 2. ca. 9. Tit. 7. Art. 2.* His word *hich*, I conceive he will have to relate, not to the Rule which was e next Antecedent, for this serves nothing to his purpose: but to e more remote Antecedent, which he calls the *Modification of our cts*, or our righteousnes to Justification, that it is not varied *secun-m Magis & Minùs.* Indeed *Schibler* there concludes out of *Aristotle* at Relations which have their foundation in substance or quan-ty, *non recipiunt Magis & Minùs*, have no remission or intension, but equality, fullnes or perfection in their relation (if I may speak little unproperly to please Mr. *Br.*) But that Righteousnes hath foundation in substance he seems to deny, or that it hath its undation in quantity, he saith but doth not prove. We say it hath foundation in quality, & such relations *Schibler* there acknow-dgeth to admit *Magis & Minùs.* Again *Schibler* addeth in the se-nd place, that *Relata ex parte sui, hoc est, secundum esse relationis ipsi-, non recipiunt magis & minùs.* But this hinders not why in some a sundry other respects, they should not admit it. And thus *Schib-r* doth him no good. Yet if *Schibler* were for him, I should except at the Holy Ghost is not (specially in Gospel matters) a Peripa-tick, was never a disciple of *Aristotle*, his wisdome is a Metaphy-icks more transcendent above *Aristotles* Metaphysicks, than *Aristo-s* Metaphysicks are above his Physicks. Therefore the Holy Ghost kes the liberty in Scriptures, to affirm a *Magis & Minùs* in Righte-usnes, to pronounce one more, and another less righteous in re-rence to the Rule, as hath been before shewed. Br. *Therefore our Divines usually say, that our Justification is perfect, though our sanctificati-n be not: and then I am sure our Righteousnes must be perfect.* A meer am & vanity of words! Our Divines (saith he) doth he own them? re they not such as he would rather *tollere* than *extollere?* Our Di-

vines

vines and yet not Popish Divines? our Divines usually say that
Justification is perfect. But will Mr. *Br* say so? Nay he saith po
blank in opposition to it. Yet even hence would he force in his Co
clusion, & then I am sure our Righteousnes must be perfect. A m
sophism and fallacy: we grant that the righteousnes by which
are perfectly justified, must needs be a perfect righteousnes. Bu
deny that righteousnes to be any otherwise ours than by impu
on, *viz.* Christs satisfaction. As for the Righteousnes of our sa
fication which Mr. *Br* makes the condition of our justifying, we
terly deny either to be perfect in this life, or to have any finger
the busines of Justification.

When he finds all his other shifts too weak to hide the nake
of his Conclusion, at length he flyeth to his sophisticall distinct
according to his usuall manner, to obscure & darken what he ca
not confirm & clear up in the light to be of God. B: *A twofold p
fection is here implyed* (saith he) 1 *a Metaphysicall perfection of Being, a
perfection of sufficiency in order to its end.* These two he jumbles & tu
bles together, sometimes into a Confusion, & then out of the Ch
that he hath made goes about to separate them again into some
stinct order, so far that if there be any that can see things which
not as if they were, may discern either from other so perfectly a
distance that he shal never attain the one or the other as a perfect
of Righteousnes to his justification. The former he makes to be
Materiall entity of a non ens, (as he had before defined Righteousn
the Materiall Being of that which is not a being. And this, saith h
is the sincerity of our faith, *i.e.* of our Sanctification (for so he m
neth:) this is the first perfection of our own righteousnes to justi
cation. Let us suppose now that there is such a Metaphysicall p
fection in the sincerity of our righteousnes and the matter there
what doth this make to his purpose, that there is a perfection in o
personall righteousnes to justifie us? I shall demand these questi
of him. 1 Whether a Metaphysicall perfection of Being, in the ma
ter of our Righteousnes be the perfection of righteousnes which
required to justification? Is there not a Metaphysicall being yea p
fection of being in the matter of all the Acts of righteousnes wh
the very heathen and reprobates perform? 2 Whether Sincerity b
perfection of righteousnes, any further than it is more or less si
cere, perfect sincerity being a perfect perfection, unperfect sincer
an unperfect perfection, perfect it may be in its Metaphysicall be
ing, that is unperfect in its degrees: But must there not be also a mo
rall

l perfection in a righteousneſs perſonall that ſhall be perfect to
ife. 3 Whether there be not ſin & imperfection in the beſt ſince-
y of the Saints during this life, a mixture of unbeleef with their
th, of fleſh with Spirit, of doublenes with their ſimplicity? 4 Whe-
r this mixture be not evill and a ſin in reference to the New, as
ll as to the Old Covenant? Why els doth the Lord Chriſt ſo oft
rove and upbraid his diſciples with the feeblenes of their Faith?
e of little Faith, &c. *becauſe of your unbeleef. Where is your Faith?* and
h like? 5 Grant unto a man the greateſt ſincerity of Faith & ho-
es attainable by the moſt ſpirituallized Chriſtians in this life,
h God ordeined it to be a perfect righteouſnes, or is it a perfect
hteouſnes either in it ſelf, or to Juſtification? if ſo why doth the
oſtle when he could profeſs not onely his perſonall obedience as
Chriſtian, but alſo his righteouſnes and integrity as a Miniſter, to
ſo far in ſincerity, and as in the ſight of God, & in Chriſt, that he
ew nothing by himſelf, wherin he could accuſe himſelf as failing
ſincerity; nevertheles add, *Yet am I not hereby juſtified, but he that*
geth me is the Lord, 2 Cor. 1. 12. & 2. 17. 1 Cor. 4 4? This Mr. Br
th and that his reader may not ſee the weaknes of his Metaphyſi-
l materiall Righteouſneſs, he therefore Confounds it with the
rmality of it. Els ſhould he give every reader to retort upon him
own words *pag.* 121. that he pronounceth that a perfect Righte-
ſnes which is unrighteous, hatefull and accurſed, being a righte-
ſnes which in its matter is injoyned by the old Covenant, & hath
its rule in the matter thereof the Law of the old Covenant ſtill.
No leſs vain alſo is that which he diſcourſeth of the Formality of
s perſonal righteouſnes, that it is a perfect righteouſnes *in reſpect*
s perfect ſufficiency in order to its end, which is to be a condition of our
ſtification, &c. *This end* (ſaith he) *it ſhall attain. The tenor of the New*
enant is not, Beleeve in the higheſt degree and you ſhall be juſtified, but
eeve ſincerely and you ſhall be juſtified. So that our righteouſneſs 1. for-
lly conſidered in relation to the conditions of the New Covenant, is either
fect or none.

To this I anſwer that God hath ordeined no righteouſnes of ours
our Righteouſnes, to be a Condition of the New Covenant. 2. If
had ſo done, yet it follows not thence that the ſame Righteouſ-
performed, is a perfect righteouſnes, though it be ſufficient and
ctuall to the end to which God ordeined it to be performed.
d required the uſe and ſound of Trumpets and voices to deſtroy
d lay levell with the earth, the ſtrong walls and Towers of *Jeri-*

cho;

cho; and the waſhing in *Jordan* to Clean e *Naaman* of his Lepro and the waſhing in *Siloam* to Cure the Man that was born blind his blindneſs. Theſe were ordeined as ſeverall Conditions in or to thoſe ſeverall ends; and being performed became ſufficient effectuall to the attainment thereof. Shall we ſay then, that the formance of theſe Conditions was their perfect righteouſnes performed them? So neither if God had appointed Faith which cording to Mr. *Br* is ſanctification, as a Condition of our Juſtific on, is the performance thereof our perfect righteouſnes. 3 Thi ficiency of that which Mr. *Br* calleth perfect righteouſnes in or to its end, is no more in & from it ſelf, than the before-mention noyces and waſhings were in themſelves, to the attainment of t ends: But the ſufficiency thereof is wholly from the righteouſ faithfulnes and all ſufficiency of God to fullfill the promiſes of grace. So that what he ſaith of beleeving in the higheſt degree, beleeving in ſincerity, is beſides the matter in queſtion; Both to ther if they could be performed according to the tenor of the Covenant, not being of ſufficiency to make up a perfect righte nes. Therefore we conclude in Mr. *Brs* words, *That our Righteou formally conſidered in relation to the condition of the new Covenant, is from being a perfect Rigbteouſneſs, that it is none at all.*

I have nothing els to ſay againſt that wherewith he conclude explication of the *Theſis*, enumerating the many reſpects in wh this imaginary righteouſnes of man is imperfect, and conſequ ſinfull; But this that it diſplayes the ſin and impudency of the that he will call that a perfect righteouſnes, which himſelf con ſeth to be ſo deficient, rotten, and unrighteous.

Theſis 26. *pag.* 137.

In the 26 *Theſis* he addeth to the perfection of Mans righteouſ merit or meritorioufnes alſo. In my exception againſt him t this point, I ſhal take notice, 1 of his poſition or aſſerting of thi ſtrine, 2 of his lenifying & mitigating the roughnes thereof, th may go down the more gently & pleaſantly. In both which it ſ ſuffice to ſhew that he ſpeaketh the ſame things with the Papiſt Maſters, & that in their Tone alſo; though I do not *ex profeſſo*, un take a full Confutation of the doctrine it ſelf, leaving the reader fetch it from thoſe many Orthodox Divines that have copiouſly unanſwerably done it againſt profeſſed Papiſts. In this I ſhall ſee ingly croſs yet really follow Mr. *Brs* method, putting firſt what the firſt & primary purpoſe of his heart to hold out unto the wo *viz.* that our Righteouſnes is meritorious; (though in a pretty

tlety he puts it fall both in the *Thesis* & in its explication,) and left that which he puts first, *viz.* his limitation & mitigation of so arrogant a doctrine, which he doth so trimly & featily, that if his reader be a fool it is possible he may think Mr. Br to deny, and not to assert here the doctrine of merits; though there were never any of the worst Papists that hath asserted it higher than Mr. *Br* here doth. His assertion of merits then, runs in these words in the *Aphorism* it self.

B: *In a large sense, as promise is an obligation, and the thing promised is called debt, so the performers of the Conditions of the New Covenant are called Worthy, and their performance Merit, though properly it is all of Grace and not of Debt*, Rom. 4. 4. 10. And all those Scriptures which he annexeth and I have before in adding this to the 24th Thesis transcribed.

1 His assertion of Merit in mans righteousnes is here layd down in a Connexive proposition, The performers of the conditions of the new Covenant are called *Worthy*, & their performance *Merit*. If both members of the proposition be not true, if either fail, the proposition is false. But where doth he mean these are so called? in the Scriptures which he here annexeth all men will (it is questionles his meaning is that all shall) conceive. (For to say that they are so called by Popish Writers were to make his doctrine suspected, not accepted.) But neither in these nor any other Scriptures are they so Called; therefore his proposition is false. The 13 first Scriptures alleaged, affirm the contrary; deny all worth, all merit, in our persons & righteousnes, pronounce the reward, to be of grace not of debt, a gift, not a payment, given freely, without desert: & all this so fully that it appears the Holy Ghost had an aim not onely to stop the mouths of the mercenary *Jewes* then, but also of the *Popish Justiciares* now, whom he foresaw as enemies to the docerine of Grace. And the last six Scriptures here alleaged prove onely that the Scriptures call the Saints worthy, but neither in these nor in any other Scripture can he finde that their performances are called merit, or their Justification here or glorification hereafter debt.

2 By the way we may take notice of his fallacious sophistry to deceive the simple, in making the whole worth of the performers to consist in their performances, because the performers of such an act are called worthy, therefore there must be merit and worth in the performance. Which is grounded upon as good reason as if I should say, *The Murtherer of Uriah, and the abjurer of Christ were counted worthy of justification and glory.* Therefore was there an unproper worth (at least) in the ones murther & the others abjuration to Justice & save

them. None of these nor any other Scriptures do affirme (in expresse words) the performers of the conditions of the new Covenant *Worthy*, much lesse, as they are performers; and least of all that the performance hath worth or merit in it.

3 Besides there is a great difference between Gods *Dignari* & mans *Dignũ esse*: between Gods accounting or reckoning man worthy, & mans being worthy in his own deserts; so that those Scriptures, *Lu.* 20.35. *Lu.* 21.36. 2 *Thes.* 1.5, 11. that speak of Gods accounting men *worthy*, do not import or imply any worth in a mans own qualifications & performances: but a worth which God hath put upon him by imputation, *viz.* Christ in them, the bloud of Christ sprinkled upon their Conscience, Christs merits imputed to them, they being found in Christ the righteous, & not in *Adam* the unrighteous. As the *Israelites* were accounted worthy of deliverance from destruction which fell upon the *Egyptians* in the day of Gods passing over *Egypt*; but how worthy? surely not in respect of their own righteousnes, but in respect of the worth of the Paschal Lambs bloud sprinkled upon their door-posts. In this sense is also that of *Rev.* 3.4. to be taken. And hereunto runs the whole tenor of the Gospel, making not our own righteousnes & works, *but Christ in us the hope of Glory*, i.e. all the ground and worth upon which we may Cherish within ourselves a lively hope of glory, *Col.* 1.27.

4 The word *worthy* in Scriptures oft signifieth, *Meet*, beseeming & answerable to: as *Ma.* 3.8. *Bring forth fruits worthy of Repentance*, & *Eph.* 4.1. *Walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.* & *Col.* 1.10. *Walk worthy of the Lord.* The meaning is that we should bring forth fruits beseeming the repentance which we profess, & walk agreeable unto, & in ways becoming our holy vocation, & answerable to the Grace of God in the Lord Jesus Christ: not to make our selves worthy of the gift of repentance, of so high a vocation, & of so glorious a Christ to be conferred upon us. And in the same sense are those other scriptures, *Ma.* 10.11, 12, 13, 37 & 22.8. alleaged here by Mr. B. to be taken. Where those that are termed *worthy or unworthy of Christ and his Gospel*, are meant to be such as carry themselves in a way becoming or not becoming Christ and his Gospel preached to them. Without any hinting at an imaginary worth or Merit in their performances that might make them deservers of Christ, and the grace of the Gospel: as is easie to be made out, from the very Texts here alleaged, if there were need thereof.

Thus it appears to be false, either that in a larger sense, promise is an obligation, & the thing promised is called Debt: or that the performer

formers of the cõditiõs are called *worthy*, & their performance *merit*, in the scriptures. And consequently neither the fallacies nor the falsities of Mr *Br* do any thing avail him here to the setting up of Mans & the frustrating of Christs Merits, wch is the scope of his levelling.

The explication in reference to this part of the *Thesis* hath nothing that may be called an addition to it. Onely there *pag.* 141. as here in describing the third kinde of meriting, he tels us, that *The obligation to reward is Gods ordinate Justice, & the truth of his promise; & the worthines lyeth in the performance of the Conditions on our part.* He doubted (it seems) that we would have taken him (notwithstanding that which he had said equipollent with this in the *Thesis*) to have had some seed of Christian modesty & humility remaining in him, that he had not totally forsworn all self-deniall, unless he should express, & therefore hath expressed himself as the ful here, to be ful of self-arrogance.

But in this doth he declare his intolerable contempt of the word, that having himself quoted (at the least) 13 testimonies of scripture, all with one harmony affirming, that Gods Gospel dispensations are free, of meer grace & mercy, without any reference to our works & righ eousnese, that Gods grace & mans works or worth cannot stand together, but that they destroy either the other in reference to Justification & salvation: That mans merit in any respect without difference is a subversion and deny all of Gods grace in all respects; (For all this he shall find that will but peruse the 13 first scriptures wch Mr *B.* quoteth in this *Thesis*) yet he doth elude all wch this frothy distinction in the beginning of the same *Thesis*: True, *Our Performances cannot be said to Merit in the most strict & proper sense, &c. but in a larger sense they may.* What is this but to oppose the sacred verity of the most high God, with the froth of mans wit? what Scripture shall henceforth stand in its venerable Majesty & authority, if the boldnes of a corrupt worm shall thus puff it to nothing? Of all other men I conceive Mr *Br* hath most need to make grace alone & free Mercy his refuge: For of all that I have met with accounted Members of any of the reformed Churches, I never found any whose very meritorious services (as he terms them) such as this work of his is, have more provocation in them. But thus farr of his assertion which we have found full of the Leven, or rather to be the Leaven it self of the Scribes and Pharisees both of the former and latter ages. Let us see now how he lenifieth & sweeteneth it, that his sacrilege in robbing God of the honour of his grace appear not.

B: *We ascribe not Merit* (saith he in the *Thesis*) *to our works, as Merit is taken in its most proper and strict sense, seeing there is nothing*

in the value of it, or any benefit that God receiveth by it, which may entitle it Meritorius: Neither is there any proportion betwixt it and the reward, but in a larger sense, as promise is an obligation and the thing promised is debt, &c.

Yet in the explication, p. 138, he grants to man a capacity of Meriting somwhat at the hands of God in this sense also, lest he should seem to acknowlege that there are some of the worst reprobates yea devills, that have not at all merited from God; But of these he Concludes p. 139. that it is a poor kind of Meriting which they can boast of yet without some Merit, & that of good from the Justice of God he will not leave them destitute. But in the Conclusion of the explication *pag.* 141. he adds somewhat more to take off the harshnes of his self-ascribing doctrine of Merit: thus;

B: *This kinde of Meriting is no diminution to the greatnes or freenes of the Gift or Reward: because it was a free and gratious Act of God, to make our performance capable of that title; and to engage himself in the foresaid promise to us; and not for any gain that he expecteth by us, or that our performance can bring him.*

Lo ye now, the strength of this mans wit, that can blow heaven & earth into a confusion with one breath, & with the next breath set both into their due place and order again. Nothing inferior is the slight of his wit to the slight and dexterity of that head-mans hand that is reported so nimbly to execute his office that having cut off the head, he left it standing without any wagging upon the shoulders still. So this man hews off the honour of Gods grace yet leaves it in all its glory without diminution still. Yet let us reckon with the man a little. Can he name any one of the worst Papists or Jesuits that doth attribute Merit to mans works in a higher degree than, or doth not when he hath extolled mans Merits, salve the grace of God as finely as himself? Are not his words and theirs about Gods Grace and mans merits the same? Doth he add any thing here of his own that he hath not learned of them? *We cannot merit* (saith Mr Br) *in the most strict and proper sense:* Why? Alas, saith he, *There is nothing in the value of our works, or any benefit that God receives by them, that may entitle them Meritorious; Neither is there any proportion between them and the Reward.* Do not *Bellarmine* and his brethren speak altogether so fully & more fully, seemingly to vindicate the grace of God from all ecclipsing by their doctrine of Merit? *Merit as strictly and properly taken* (say they) *must be,* 1 *Ex propriis,* 2 *ex indebitis,* 3 *Ad equalitatem. 1 It must be of somethng of our own which we have not received; 2 of that which we were not indebted or bound to perform; 3 It must come up to a ful*

proportion

portion of equality in value with the reward which it meriteth. And thus
y they) no man can merit with God. For neither hath he any
ing of his own to offer unto God wch he hath not received from
od, nor any ſtrength to act meritoriouſly, but what he hath rece-
d from above, & is inſpired by grace into him; So that *Antoninus*
t Poſtill Schoolman, Concludes that in this Caſe that Fathers
nclusion is authentick, which ſaid it before him, though not pun-
ally in the ſame words *Quum enim Deus coronat Merita noſtra, re* *Anton par.*
nerat Munera ſua, quia ſcilicet ipſe dedit virtutem operandi gratis. When *4. Tit. 9. ca.*
od Crowns our Merits, he rewards his own gifts, becauſe himſelf *7. ante ſect.*
h freely given us the ſtrength ſo to work. Nor 2 Can he do any
ng but is his due obedience he owes it as homage to his Creator.
d3 is to proportion & equality, even *Bellarmine* that affirms *quan-*
n infinitatem, a certain infiniteness in mans works, not as they pro-
d from man, but as the Holy Ghoſt which is infinite, is the author
them, yet concludes, *Nemo poteſt paria reddere Deo* Our works can
ver mount up to an equality with Gods bounty. In this proper
ſe therefore all the worſt hornets of the Romiſh hive do explode
erits with as much deteſtation as Mr. *Br.*

In like manner what he tels us in the beginning of the explicati-
of Merits in ſtrict Juſtice which he doth in part abandon; is but a
linction which he hath learned from the Jeſuits which diſtinguiſh
wixt Merits in ſtrict Juſtice, & Merits in gracious acceptance, re-
ing the former, and attributing unto man a power onely to per-
rm that wch God will graciouſly accept for Merit. Yea when *Cal-*
e will expreſs what uſe the whole rabble of Popiſh Schoolmen
ke of this evaſion, not troubling himſelf to alleage their particu-
words, he contracts the ſumme of all that they all ſay into theſe
rds of his own: *Aunt. Non tanti eſſe intrinſeca dignitate bona opera, ut* *Cal. Inſt.*
juſtitiã comparanda, ſufficiant. ſed hoc acceptantis eſſe Gratiæ quod tantùm *lib 3. ca. 14.*
ſit. They acknowlege that mans good works are not worth a ruſh *ſect. 14.*
their own intrinſecall worth to Merit or obtein Righteouſneſs
fore God,] but that it is of Gods Grace accepting that they are
ſuch value.

And what he ſaith at the end of the explication, [that *this kinde of*
riting is no diminutiõ to the greatnes or freenes of the gift or reward, Be-
ſe it was a free and gracious Act of God that made our works capable of
s title, and to engage himſelf by promiſe to us, &c.] is it is in ſubſtance
e & the ſame thing which he had ſaid before, to make his doctrine
pear ſufferable, ſo is it that which he hath ſuckt from the breaſts
the Holy Mother Church of *Rome* alſo. It is the plea of all the Po-

piſh

Inst. li. 3. *ca.* 17. *sect.* 3. pith Sophisters saith *Calvin*, *Qui bel'e se absurda omnia evasisse pu non intrinseca sua bonitate valere opera ad salutem promerenda, sed ex ratione, quia Dominus liberalitate sua tanti æstimavit*, i. e. who thou that they had bravely discharged themselves of all the absurdi [which follow this doctrine] by saying that our works do not m to merit salvatiō by their own intrinsick goodnes, but by reaso Gods Covenant or promise, because he of his free bounty hath p such a value upon them. And still affirming that the Merit of wo

Ibid. ca. 17. *sect.* 15. doth not at all Clowd Gods grace, *Quia a Gratia acceptante babe um valorem*, i.e. because it is the gracious acceptance of God that titles them to this honour.

I shall instance no further in particulars: onely in generall I af there is not to be found any of the most Trentified & deepest br ded Papists, that hath in this point spoken more derogatorily the grace of God, or more superlatively to the exalting of m menstruous righteousnes; but contrariwise divers especially of more ancient Schoolmen that have spoken more modestly & mo rately of both, than Mr *Br*. So high in the conceit of his own wo & perfection, have the praises of his righteousnes & vertues dec ted by some throughout the Country, coming (as it is probable) his ears, enthroned him. Or if it be not either the proud opinio his own vertues and righteousnes, or an ambition to be esteem matchles and unanswerable in any Paradox that he undertak maintain, or a vow that he hath made to return & bring what P felytes he can with him to *Babylon*; which hath; let him shew wha is that hath induced him, thus to pervert & disturb the Church Christ with these Antichristian doctrines, by raising them to l again after they have so long layd almost dead and buryed ther

But whether there be not as concinnous an agreement & unif mity, in Mr *Brs* doctrines of the perfection & Merit of mans rig ousnes; & yet while his righteousnes is thus perfect & Meritor with God, he remains notwithstanding under the Curse of the L and wrath of God untill the day of Judgement, (as before he h asserted) whether these things do not so trimly agree together, a Crown on the head, and a halter about the neck, I leave to ev rationall man to Judge.

That which he hath in the middle part of his explication ab Merits of man which the Wisdom (not the Justice) of God is bo to reward; as also sundry passages that he hath about Merits i strict Justice of God; I leave as meer fopperies unworthy of read much more of answering. Onely this I affirm that he doth here

qual

allize the merits of mans with the merits of Chriſts righteouſnes,
neither hath Chriſt merited from Gods naturall but his ordi-
e Juſtice, not in the ſtrict, but in the large ſenſe.

His 25 *Theſis* lying betwixt theſe 2 that I have coupled together,
aſſe by without any particular examination of the particulars in
or in the Explication of it, becauſe it hath not any thing in it
ntroverted between us & the Papiſts, though what he ſaith there,
ſaid with an intention to lappup himſelf in an Antipopiſh dreſs
at he may be the leſs ſuſpected when he comes to ſowr us with
e leaven of the Papiſts. He ſaw theſe 2 *Theſes* which I have exami-
d together, *viz.* Perfection & Merits of works, if they ſhould come
gether one in the neck of another, without any Calm betwixt
em, would make ſo terrible a ſound as would be enough to wa-
n and ſtartle all that were but ſleeping and not dead, for fear the
ope or the Devill had been come to aſſault them; Therfore to keep
l quiet he interpoſeth this *Theſis* and its explication, in which he
lls the ears of our Divines for ſaying that God doth juſtifie firſt
ir perſons and then our duties and actions. *pag.* 134. *& deinceps* in
e explication, telling us it is a doctrine of dangerous conſequence
any wayes, and except we will take it in his, that is, in the Popiſh
nſe, it ſmells rankly of Popery, & ſetts up Juſtification by works,
om the very thought whereof he ſtarts & ſtartles away as affrigh-
d. Notable diſſimulation, not of a learner but of one learned in
e Trade, *Clodius accuſat Mæchos, Catilina Cethegum.*

He that affirms our Righteouſneſs equall with the righteouſnes
Chriſt to juſtification, that entitles it a perfect righteouſnes, a me-
torious righteouſnes, is the firſt man in all the world that fears of
e advancing of Juſtification by works, by them whom he hateth
r oppugning it. If there were that which he calls danger in this
hraſe or doctrine, of ſetting up ſuch a juſtification, would not him-
lf be the firſt man to kiſſe it, to eat it up, to promote it? What is it
at makes him to diſreliſh the phraſe ſo extremely? Is it not that it
verts his order in Juſtification, that he would have the works to
ſtifie the man, when contrariwiſe this doctrine makes the juſtifica-
on of the perſon to be the ground of the acceptance of his obedi-
ce? Is it not the very depth *of Satan*, from which he is moved to
iſe & diſguiſe himſelf, to act Satans part with all guile and ſub-
ety to betray the Saints of Chriſt and the truth of Chriſt to dam-
ing Popery, and yet here and there to tranſform himſelf into an
ngel of Light, a Miniſter of Righteouſnes, to blinde the eyes of the
mple that they may not eſpy him untill they be taken in his ſnare
nd loſt for ever.

As

As for the doctrine or phrase it self, he knowes our Divines mean this onely when they say, *God doth justifie first our persons and then our duties & actiõs*, viz. That God having first justified their persons from all the guilt that was upon them, doth thenceforth also justifie them in reference to all the duties wch thorow Christ the Mediator they shall perform unto God, not imputing to them the imperfections thereof, so that they may rest Confident of Gods accepting both the performers and the performance in and through Christ the beloved. In this respect and not as Conditions of the New Covenant (as Mr. *Br* dreameth) doth the Gospel teach our works to be accepted of God.

There is yet one link of the Popish Chain wanting, without which it will be imperfect and unusefull. If it were granted that there is, 1 a personall righteousnes of Gods own appointment necessary to justification 2 That this righteousnes consisteth in our own Faith and sanctification, or good works. 3 That it is a perfect one 4 a Meritorious Righteousnes: yet all this cannot be effectuall either to save or deceive us, unless it be a righteousnes also possible for us to perform. That he might not be wanting therefore to the Popish Cause in any one branch of Popish doctrine, he addeth this also.

Thesis 27 in these words, *pag.* 141.

Bax: *As it was possible for Adam to have fulfilled the Law of Works, by that power which he received by Nature; so is it possible for us to perform the Conditions of the New Covenant by the power which we receive from the Grace of Christ.*

To which he adds in the Explication, *pag* 142 &c.

Bax: *This possibility is to be understood not in Relation to the strength of the Agent, but in the Relative sense, the Conditions of the New Covenant are possible to them that have the assistance of Grace.*

So that strength which was in *Adam* to fullfill, was a power which he received by Nature; But the strength by which we perform, is the power which we receive from the grace of Christ. If any should have asked him what that grace of Christ was, the man was very Coy, he could, but he would not tell, whether it were a Paulin or a Pelagian Grace; a grace equally extended both to the Elect and the Reprobats, or a grace peculiar to the Elect; a grace that comes no further than the ear, or a grace operating upon the heart also; &c. He had other fish to fry and had not the leizure to stay & crack these nuts now He bids us to turn over many volumes and specially *Parkers Theses*, to search if possibly we can finde what Mr. *Brs* judgment would be many years after in this poynt. But it is easie to perceive the mans meaning by his gaping in many passages of this book. We should have had all this in cold and file in his much promised Tractate of *Universall Redemption*, by which as by a second famous atchievement he meant to endear himself to his holy Father, but that unluckily there is one of his own spirit step into his Holinesses Parlour to present him with this gift, and so anticipated this favour which Mr. *Br* would have had entire to himself; so that now the expected advantage being lost, & he not using to open his Commodities to sale a day before the Fayr, we might possibly for a couple of Capons obtein to know his meaning herein In the mean while, it must needs be his intent in reserving to himself what he meant by grace, to put upon us a kind of impossibility to say readily, yea or nay to his asserted possibility of performing the Conditions of the New Covenant by a power which he leaves us uncertain of knowing what it is.

As for the two fold opposition which he puts in his *Thesis*, 1. between the conditions of the Old Covenant & New, 2. Between the power which *Adam* had by nature, and the power which we have by the Grace of Christ; there is nothing but a windy sound of words therein, to deceive his reader into an opinion that he hath some honest and sound meaning in what is here posited or said. For neither doth he make any real difference between the conditions of these two Covenants: but makes our own Righteousnesse, consisting in faith and works, to be the substance of the conditions of both Covenants, onely he puts a supposed difference in the measure of them: One, an imaginary perfection of sincerity in doeing them, answering to what the New Covenant requireth; the other, an absolute and gradual perfection in doing them without the least particle omitted or committed, besides or against the rigorous exaction of the Old Covenant. And this is a difference made up of a mans dreaming fancy without any least footing that it hath in, or sustentation by the Word of God; which utterly shakes off all mans righteousnes, works, and qualifications in either, and both senses, from having any thing to do in the businesse of justification under the New Covenant, as hath been in part already, and shall be in its due place (if God will) more fully demonstrated afterward.

Nor doth he mean 2 things, by *Adams* power by nature, and our power by Grace. Nature there, and grace here, to him are one & the same. For was not the power which *Adam* had to stand, a power received by Grace? what a malignant eye hath he, so extremely to envie the raies of Gods Grace, when they lustre, and by their brightnes discover the dimnesse and invalidity of mans nature? He will own no longer *Peter Lombard* himselfe to be the *Magister*, if he affirm (as hee doth affirm) that the power which *Adam* had to fulfill the conditions of the Old Covenant, was (not by grace, but) by nature; or what means he by the grace of Christ now? doth he under this word point out any other power than every man hath or may have, that is no more Christified, or Spirituallized now, than *Adam* was then? yea than he was immediately after his fall? This book of his in many parcels of it doth (not obscurely) insinuate thus much of him; and if we judge amisse, it is his fault in writing so ambiguously and refusing to explain his own meaning that mini-

 streth

ſtreth cauſe and evidence enough ſo to judge.

But as to the thing it ſelfe here poſited by Maſter *Baxter*: we utterly deny that God hath ever given, or any where promiſed to give unto the beſt of men in the ſtate of ſinfull infirmity, ſuch a meaſure of *Grace*, as might put him into a poſſibility by the power which he hath received, to performe either a righteouſneſſe effectual and ſufficient to juſtification, or a righteouſneſſe perfect and Meritorious; or a righteouſnes which as righteouſnes, and by a worthineſſe in it ſelfe, can give him right and title to the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to juſtifie him. And theſe are the things which Mr. *Baxter* here either with the grace, or without, and againſt the grace of God contendeth for; but neither hath, nor ever will have the grace of God, from the Word of God, to prove and demonſtrate; though he bangle and bungle never ſo much with his looſe ſhifts of Sophiſtry, to give out an appearance to them that are more delighted with appearance then with ſubſtance, as if he had done it.

Chap. XVIII.

Arg. *An examination of Mr.* Baxters *Doctrine about the nature and uſe of the Moral Law, upon what grounds, and in what ſenſe and degrees the righteouſneſſe thereof is required under the Goſpel, what relation it hath to the Covenants, and each of them. His Paradox of ſincere, not perfect obedience required under the New Covenant; and his extravagancies about all the reſt of theſe particulars diſcovered.*

THe three following Theſes, *viz.* the 28, 29, and the 30th, I purpoſely pretermit without examination, not that there is nothing in them which deſerveth exception againſt it, but becauſe whatſoever therein calls for examination by the touch-ſtone of the Word, is either not controverted between us and the Papiſts about the point of Juſtification, or elſe hath been ſaid, and anſwered before; or thirdly will offer it ſelf againe more properly to bee anſwered in the following part of this Tractate, where we ſhall find Mr. *Baxter* ſpeaking it out more fully then he hath done here in theſe Theſes, and their explications.

To

To the 31 Thesis, pag. 154. as it is considered in, and by it self, I have nothing to object: but to the Explication thereof, pag. 155. *& deinceps*, I have somewhat to say, yet not altogether by way of exception against it, but partly also for the illustration of some grounds to answer him in things which in the following part of this Treatise hee hath to deliver; accordingly as he layes down here for delivering them. His words therefore I first transcribe, beginning at pag. 155.

B. *That the Morall Law is yet in force, I will not stand to prove, because so many have written of it already. See Mr.* Anthony Burgesses *Lectures. But to what ends, and in what sense the Gospel continueth that Law, and commandeth perfect obedience thereto, is a question not very easie.*

1. *Whether Christ did first repeal that Law, and then re-establish it to some other ends? So some think.*

2. *Or whether he hath at all made the Morall Law the preceptive part of the New Covenant? and so whether the New Covenant doth at all command us perfect obedience? or onely sincere?*

3. *Whether the Moral Law be continued onely as the precepts of the Old Covenant, and so used by the New Covenant meerly for a directive Rule?*

To the first I answer:

1. *That it is not repealed at all I have proved already; even concerning the Covenant of Workes it self, and others enough have proved at large of the Moral Law.*

2. *Yet that Christ useth it for other ends, and for the advancement of his Kingdom, I grant.*

What is here meant by the Morall Law must bee first understood, before there can be any well-grounded consenting, or dissenting in judgements about the force in which it yet standeth. Both the word *Law*, and the word *Moral*, have their ambiguity, and are used in divers senses.

1. The word *Law* is taken sometimes onely for a rule, or guide, or directive, to give us light to discern between truth and falsehood, good and evill, lawfull and unlawfull; to which also may be added, a power therein to command duty, and to prohibit, what is contrary to duty. Sometimes it is taken in a larger sense

alſo, comprehending all theſe things in it, and withall a promiſe of reward to the performers, and commination of penalty to its tranſgreſſors. Here I conceive Mr. *Baxter* taketh the word *Law* in the former ſenſe onely, becauſe pag. 156. in anſwer to the firſt queſtion, he diſtinguiſheth, and puts a difference between the Covenant of Works, and the Morall Law, ſo plainly, as he did, *totidem verbis*, tell us that hee underſtands by the Morall Law, the rule and precepts of Holyneſſe, and Righteouſneſſe, as conſidered apart from the pactionary Adjunct of life and death going with it.

2. The word *Morall* alſo hath its divers ſenſes; ſometimes Divines take it in a larger ſenſe, for all whatſoever pertaines to manners; and then by the Morall Law they underſtand all the Commandements, or Rules which God giveth for the regulating of our manners, in reference to the qualifications of the mind, and the outward operations alſo: Whether thoſe Commandements bee either of naturall, or of poſitive right, written in mans heart at his creation, or had their firſt poſiture in time from the word, and lips of God. Sometimes in a ſtricter ſenſe, for that which doth eminently above other things concern the life and manners. And then by the Moral Law they underſtand ſometimes the Decalogue, or Law of the ten Commandments: Sometimes the Law of Nature, or naturall Righteouſneſs imprinted in mans heart at his firſt creation.

Here taking it for granted, that Mr. *Baxter* meaneth by the Morall Law, the doctrine of the Law conſidered as a rule of Righteouſneſs, not as a Covenant of Works:

If 1. he mean by the Morall Law all Commandements both of naturall and poſitive right; I deny the Morall Law ſo taken to be in the whole, and in every part now in force.

If 2. he mean by it the Decalogue, or Law of the tenne Commandements, as it was given upon Mount *Sinai* in time, ſo himſelf knoweth it, to bee the judgement of many Divines, that it bound the Nation of *Iſrael* alone, was not at all given to the Gentiles, doth not at all bind us that are not of the Nation of *Iſrael*; otherwiſe then it clears up to us the Law of Nature written in our hearts, which doth bind us; or as the duties thereof are required of us in the New Teſtament, by the Lord Chriſt, whom we acknowledge to be our King. See *Zanchius, Tom.* 4. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 11. *Theſ.* 1. Where he fully handles, and confirms this aſſertion;

ſertion; adding moreover, *Sic etiam inſignes Theologi omnes ſen-*
unt, i. e. All Divines of note are of this judgement. Withall,
t there are ſome things contained in ſome of the ten Com-
andements, not pertaining to the *jus naturæ*, ſave in their *ge-*
y, and that ſomewhat remote, I know Mr. *Baxter* will not de-
, and if I thought any elſe would queſtion it, it were eaſie to
demonſtrated. But if he mean by the Morall Law, the Law of
ature, as aforeſaid, as it is written in the heart; yea as it is
rther illuſtrated, either by the book of the Creatures, or by the
alogue, as it is epitomized in Tables of ſtone, and explained
d amplified in both Teſtaments; ſo I grant the Moral Law to be
ll in force; *viz.* as a directive of Moral obedience ſtill.

What Mr. *Baxter* addeth, [*viz. to what ends, and in what ſenſe*
Goſpel continueth that Law, and commandeth perfect obedience
reto, is a queſtion not very eaſie] is to me a ſtrange ſpeech, in
ny reſpects. For 1. I cannot ſee how the queſtion can be dif-
lt to him that will not *Nodum in ſcirpo quærere*, make the
ine wayes of God rugged, by filling them up with bryars
d thorns. To the ſame moſt honourable ends, and in the
e ſenſe is it continued, for, and in which it was firſt given; I
an to the ſame ends in general, though not in every far remote
ticular. Firſt to make his glory elucent in this Microcoſm,
s choice peece of his Workmanſhip: *Man is the glory of God*,
h the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 11. 7. How? but as he bears the image of
d, not onely in rule and dominion, but alſo in wiſdome,
yneſs, and righteouſneſs, to manage that authority, and rule
erewith the grace of God hath inveſted him. And this glory
God upon man is by ſo much the more conſpicuous, by how
ch the more perfectly he reſembles God in wiſdom, righteouſ-
s, and holyneſs.

Beſides it was both given and continued, to direct and enable
n in ſome meaſure to render to God his Pepper-corn (as
. *Baxter* terms it) in teſtification of his homage, and thank-
neſſe, both for the favours received, and for the favours promi-
: without the guidance of the Morall Law written without,
yea within us alſo, we ſhould, though our affections were
r ſo ſweetly ſanctifyed, for lack of ſound illumination,
ſent God with wild grapes in ſtead of grapes, with an abo-
nation inſtead of due obedience and devotion. And are not
ſe ends as requiſite in the ſtate of mans Renovation, as

they were in the ſtate of his innocency?

Yea further, unpoſſible was it, that Chriſt ſhould not conf the Morall Law, no leſſe unpoſſible then it is for God to be righteous, or not God: *He came to fulfill all righteouſneſs*, to deſtroy any one branch of naturall and eſſential righteouſ The Morall Law is the image of God, in which we may the nature of God: The rule and platform is in God him originally, this is but an extract from it, and abſtract o Chriſt came to reſtore it, not to quench it, to ſet it up in m perfection, not to deface it by any diminution: For ſo ſhould have abaſed the glory of his Father, ſhining in his li image.

And laſtly, not to have commanded perfect, but a maim bedience thereto, had been againſt the rule of righteouſ which bids us *to render to every one his due, his whole du God the things that pertain to God*; yea the whole that pertai him. All is but a Pepper-corn to a whole kingdome of G held, and of glory expected from him; and ſhould not Chri quire the payment of a Pepper-corn whole and entire, wi diminiſhing, or dividing it?

But the truth is, that the queſtion is difficult to bee anſw without cruſhing Mr. *Baxters* Goſpel Juſtification by Work in reference to Chriſts Goſpel Juſtification by free Grace; it the Commandement of perfect obedience to the Morall ſweetly cohereth. The command of perfect obedience t Morall Law, as a condition of Juſtification, leaves all hopeleſſe of Juſtification, ſure to condemnation for ever. cauſe none can perform the condition in this life. But whe are juſtified freely by the blood of Chriſt; and then by w anſwering the grace of our Juſtifier with our reall thankfu we are bidden to render our obedience more and more perf not ſlacking our endeavours, untill we come to full perfe Though we attain it not in this preſent life, yet our not at ment doth but encreaſe our ſelf-abaſement, and make us that Chriſt is our all, and we are nothing; but doth in no deſtroy our Juſtification, or leſſen the joy of the Holy Ghoſt peace of conſcience, which are bottomed only, and wholly Chriſt, and not upon our ſelves at all.

Now let us ſee how he will make the queſtion difficult t as it muſt be to him.

Firſt, ſaith he, it is a queſtion, *Whether Chriſt did firſt repeale the Law, and then re-eſtabliſh it to other ends? So ſome think.*

A meer windy queſtion of ſuch as delight to play with God in contempt, as the Froggs with *Jupiters* Log. Where are thoſe ſame thinkers? No leſſe rationally might they feign that the ſaid Jeſus pluckt down his Father *Joſephs* houſe, & re-edified it for this other end, that men might goe in and out no more at the doors, but at the windows.

Mr. *Baxter* waſheth his hands clean from having a finger in the pye. *Nay*, ſaith he, *I have proved already, that it is not repealed at all, even concerning the Covenant of Works it ſelf. i. e.* That Chriſt is ſo farre from taking from us the perfect rule of righteouſneſſe, that he (however hee be called a Saviour) yet hath left all men, without ſaving any, to be damned for their unrighteouſneſs. But what he hath proved before, I ſuppoſe, we have diſproved, and that ſufficiently, before.

Yet, ſaith he, *that Chriſt uſeth it* (*i. e.* the Morall Law, without the ſeparable adjunct of the Covenant of Works thereunto annexed) *to other ends I grant.* He grants that which none demands of him. But what title he hath to make ſuch a grant, he ſhews not. And I think it will coſt him ſo much labour as will make him ſweat under the ſaddle, before he be able to ſhew to what other ſubſtantial, and not meerly circumſtantiall ends it now ſerveth, beſides thoſe to which it ſerved at the firſt creation therein mans innocency, at leaſt after his principles, that holdeth the workes thereof now under the Goſpel to tend to Juſtification.

But from this he paſſeth to a ſecond queſtion which he makes place to ariſe.

B. *Queſt.* 2. *Or whether he hath at all made the Morall Law to be the preceptive part of the New Covenant, and ſo whether the New Covenant doth at all command us perfect obedience? or only ſincere?*

To this he anſwereth.

B. 1. *That the Morall Law, as it is the preceptive part of the Covenant of Works, is but delivered over into the hands of Chriſt, and ſo continued in the ſenſe before expreſſed, ſeemes plain to me.*

2. *That the Morall Law doth therefore ſo continue, to com-*

command even beleivers, and that the perfect obeying of it therefore their duty, and their not obeying, their sinne, deserving the death threatened in that Covenant.

3. That Jesus Christ hath further made use of the moral Law, for a direction to his subjects, whereby they may know his will. That whereas our sincere subjection, and obedience to Christ is part of the condition of the New Covenant that we may know what his will is, which we must endeavour to obey, & what rule our actions must be sincerely fitted and guided by; he hath therefore left us this moral Law as part of this direction, having added a more particular enumeration of some duties in his Gospel: That as when the Old Covenant said, thou shalt perfectly obey: the moral Law did partly tell them wherein they should obey: So when the New Covenant saith, thou shalt obey sincerely, the moral Law doth perfectly tell us wherein, or what we must endeavour to doe.

Before he pretended a purpose to speak of the Moral Law in it selfe, and as considered without the Covenants; but finding quickly that his Babel will not tower up out of simples, he is forced either to let all fall, or else himselfe must returne to his compoundings and confoundings again, now mixing the moral law with the olde, and by and by with the New Covenant, as appears sometimes of the one, and sometimes of the other; as if it were a Noun Adjective which cannot stand by it selfe. When contrariwise the moral Law is the rule of righteousnesse, compleat in it selfe, the very image of Gods Nature, and Will, to which every reasonable creature is bound to conform, that it may be like to God himselfe, and so illustrate either to other the splendour of Gods glory invisible in himselfe, but shining forth in their persons and performances. But the Covenants are separable adjuncts of the moral law, when annexed to the moral law, being free and voluntary Acts and Statutes of God, which hee may *pro imperio*, by the Soveraign authority which hee hath over his creatures, either have, or not have added to the moral law, at his pleasure: The Old Covenant making out to men the way of Salvation in strict, yet equal and uncorrupt Justice: The New Covenant, his way of saving sinners, and justifying the ungodly, by free grace, wherein in justice they were lost and unrecoverable. The one of these is by the perfect fulfilling of the

l law; the other without reference to the moral law at all, ely by the redemption which is by Jesus Christ.

Here now, if both Covenants were silenced, and annihilated, the moral law would abide firm still, it would as well thout Covenant as by Covenant, speak out mans duty and ob-gation, both unjustified and justified, in his state either of in-grity or infirmity, to be wise, holy and righteous, as God made m, and to act perfectly according to the perfect principles of ing first created in him; even without life and heaven before m to allure him, or death and hell behind him to enforce him. d so the moral law is no part of either Covenant essenti-y, that it cannot be separated from it without its nullify-g. Nay it was in God from all eternity, and shall be in him il, when all Covenants conditionall shall have their expira-on.

Yet let us follow Master *Baxter*, to see what businesse hee will ke in the dark, having thus obscured the clear light of this strine by his mixtures and confoundings. Hee gives many swers to this 2 question.

1. That *the moral law, as it is the preceptive part of the Cove-nt of workes, is but delivered over into the hands of Christ, and so ntinued in the sense before expressed, seems plain to me.* How ar are this mans eyes? I can see no plainness in the answer, or y part thereof. It is all intricate, and almost incomprehensi-e to our dull understanding.

For 1. I see not how the moral *Law is the preceptive part of the venant of works.* It contains in it I confesse the precepts of all od, just and holy operations, as it is the rule of all these. But w it is the preceptive part of the Covenant, being a distinct ing from it, the Covenant being added to it, and not it to the ovenant, I see not.

2. How it is delivered over into the hands of Christ, and in hat sense, is hard for me to apprehend. Is it taken out of God whom it was originally and essentially, & so put into Christs nds, that it is no more to be found in God? or is that unper-ct remainder of it which abode still in the Syntereſis, or minde d conscience of lapsed man, taken thence and put into the nds of Christ, that it is no more to be found in man, but that ter Satan had felled down the stemm and branches thereof, hrist at last hath forced thence the very root thereof also, that

there may be no more ſprouting even of an unperfect righteouſneſſe in any man, ſaving by ſome light and mover from without him? Or is it ſo put into Chriſts hand to diſpoſe of its being and office, that if he ſay the word, that which was ſhall bee no more natural or moral righteouſneſſe, much leſſe the perfect rule thereof; or that which was mans duty, and his conformity with the nature of God, if Chriſt will, ſhall be ſo no more? All these are ſuch abſurdities as cannot poſſibly drop from Maſter *Baxters* learned pen. Or is it delivered into the hands of Chriſt to be the diſpenſer and diſpoſer of it in relation to its end, wherein the natural righteouſneſſe which it preſcribeth ſhall be effectual and of neceſſary uſe to mans juſtification? This indeed were an intolerable abſurdity for one of us, that have our ſtations here below under Chriſt, to bee regulated by his doctrine, to utter. But for Maſter *Baxter* that hath ſoared upward in his Ænigmatical and Metaphyſical learning unto the ſphere of Saturn, high above the Sunne of righteouſneſſe and his light, it is no abſurdity to deliver it. It is but the language of *Rome*, that the righteouſneſſe of the moral law muſt under the Goſpel ſtill juſtifie us as when we were perfect in *Adam*, though then in him we could, but now we cannot perform it. And why ſo? not becauſe Chriſt hath declared by his word that he will ſo have it, but becauſe the holy Mother Church, that hath the power to make the word of Chriſt to dance into all formes and ſenſes after her interpretations, hath ſo decreed. If this be Mr. *Baxters* meaning, that it appears to him to be a plain truth, why doth he not make it plain to us that we may ſee it with him, but onely ſaith it, as a cathedral doctor without adding illuſtration or confirmation to it.

3. What he meaneth by that which he next ſaith, *viz.* and [it] is] ſo continued in the ſenſe before expreſſed, is not plain to me where this ſenſe is expreſſed, whether in the former part of the anſwer, & then it muſt be continued by Chriſt, to be the preceptive part of the Covenant of works ſtill: or in the queſtion, and ſo it is continued by Chriſt to be the preceptive part of the New Covenant; or in ſome one or more paſſages of the foregoing part of this his treatiſe, & ſo we ſhall be ſtill uncertain of the ſenſe, becauſe we cannot tell, and he doth not tell us where it is expreſſed. And for us to ſeek after a man in his ſenſe, who wilfully hides himſelfe and his ſenſe in the darke that wee may not find them, were but a ſenſeleſs peece of worke, eſpecially when we know it will nothing better our ſenſes in caſe we ſhould bee ſo

luckie

ckie as to finde his. I should ghess that hee means the sense pressed in the former part of this answer, and so it will be ex-ined in that which hee addeth in his second Answer, *viz.* 2. *That the moral Law doth therefore so continue &c.* as before. hat else should he mean in saying it doth continue, but that as had said in the former clause of the first answer, *viz.* to be the eceptive part of the Covenant of workes? or why doth he say, doth *therefore* so continue, but that his *therefore* bids us to ch the cause from the same answer, because Christ, into whose nds it is delivered, hath so continued it. And if so, to what rpose is all this reasoning? Tends it to affirm that it was pos-le for Christ considered either as God, or as our mediator, rescind and destroy the eternal and immutable Law of na-rall and eternall righteousnesse? or that it would have falne the ground with its own weight, if it had not been delivered o Christs hand to sustaine it? Or that it would not bee in it lf the rule of Righteousnesse for ever, except Christ had assu-ed our nature, in it to give it a second birth and stablishment? r that the Morall Law had lost its power and righteousnesse hen we had lost ours, and so it needed no lesse then we, a repa-tion? Nay whether man had sinned, or not sinned, been re-emed, or not redeemed, the Moral Law was, and is stil the same. hat the *Psalmist* saith of God, *Before the mountains were ought forth, or ever the earth and world were formed, from ever-sting to everlasting, thou art God*; Psal. 90. 2: So may I say of the oral Law, whersoever it is, and as farre as it is truly held forth d fully too, whether by Christ or by *Moses*, by the Old or by e New Testament, by the creature, by the conscience, by the hilosophers Ethicks, or by any other way or means whatsoever; fore the mountains and world were formed, from everlasting, to erlasting it hath been and is the perfect rule of Moral righteous-s stil. Neither shall it cease so to be when world and mountains e dissolved: but then we shal see perfectly in the face of God him-lfe what we now see in his either more or lesse perfect images, be perfectly configured thereunto. In the mean time evenbelei-rs have this as one of their great priviledges, to be *free from sin, d servants of Righteousnesse*: Ro. 6. 18. and so the Law of Righ-ousnesse continueth to command both beleevers and unbelee-rs, and the perfect obeying thereof is the duty of both, and the e obeying their sinne, deserving the death threatened in the

Old Covenant: But ſo that beleevers having fully done their Law in Chriſt, and being freed from the Old Covenant, though ſtill in a ſweet conjunction with the Moral Law, *Rom.*7.22. have no more their hated irregularities imputed to them, but fully forgiven for Chriſts ſake. Thus the Word of God, and Doctrine of Chriſt runne ſmoothly, and clearly, why doth Mr. *Baxter* not finde, but make whirlpooles, and ſtoppages therein, to offend, and drown poor ſoules, that cannot yet ſwim in the deep? Good ends have ſtreight wayes leading to them. Mr. *Baxters* crooked windings, argue him not to have a ſtreight and upright meaning. His unuſefull *therefore*, and *therefore*, put out of joynt that which God hath ſo compacted, as that it ought not to be diſ-joynted. And if wee would know what hee aimes at in his circumlocutions to circumvent the ſimple in theſe his two firſt anſwers, let us but follow him to the next, and we ſhall in part finde it.

B. 3. *That Jeſus Chriſt hath further made uſe of the ſame moral Law, for a direction to his ſubjects, &c.* ut ſuprà.

What he ſaith in this his third anſwer to the ſecond queſtion of the uſefulneſſe of the moral Law for direction to Beleivers, is granted. And this is one great prerogative which Beleivers have, that the moral Law, which in relation to unbeleivers hath the curſe of the Old Covenant, as a ſcourge and ſword annexed to it to take vengeance of them for their tranſgreſſions, is to them that are in Chriſt a peaceable, ſweet and unarmed counſeller. But in the opening hereof Maſter *Baxter* ſhews himſelfe to be himſelf, in foiſting in two of his unauthentick paradoxes or falſities (call them which ye will) & the ſame ſo finely with ſlight of hand interwoven in his diſcourſe, that his craft might not be eaſily eſpyed; but being eſpyed, every one that knoweth Maſter *Baxter*, may know them to be from his Artifice ſo inſerted. viz. 1. That obedience to Chriſt, in the performance of all the duties which the moral Law preſcribeth, is part of the condition of the New Covenant. 2. That the Goſpel, or New Covenant doth not require of men perfect, but ſincere obedience only. Both of theſe his ſubtilty layes down not as poſitions here firſt aſſerted, and conſequently here to be proved: But as aſſertions before proved and granted, upon which he is now ready to build his other geere and traſh which he hath in readineſs to joyne to theſe as a ſuperſtructure. *Whereas our ſincere ſubjection, and obe-*

ence

nce to Christ (saith he) *is part of the condition of the New Cove-*
nt: And where again, *When the New Covenant saith, Thou shalt*
bey sincerely, putting there this voice of the New Covenant in
pposition to the voice of the Old Covenant, which (as he tells
s) saith, *Thou shalt obey perfectly*. Here is a pretty slight to broach
rrors, a creeping into men to perswade them in despight of
heir teeth that he and they are of one mind: That he proved,
nd they granted it yesternight when they were all fast a sleep,
nd none of them spake or heard any thing. Which shall we think
is man to have more studied, *Machiavil*, or *Mildonate*? If *Bel-*
rmine were alive, hee would even shake off his red Cap with
ughter, to see a son of his so much more witty, and crafty then
is Father.

But to the matter it self.

First concerning obedience to the Morall Law, that it is part
f the condition of the New Covenant.

1. I demand where it was before proved, yea where in direct
ords asserted, that it is here taken up as a point granted? Hee
ve cause enough indeed to bee suspected of it throughout the
regoing part of this Tractate, but not evidence enough to be
pleaded for it. This is Magisterially to command Faith, as one
at speaketh by the authority of an infallible spirit, and not Mi-
sterially to teach, as one that subjecteth himself and his Do-
ine to the tryal of Gods Word.

2. I demand whether he means not by the condition of the New
ovenant, the condition upon which, and for which God will
stifie the performer? Yea that condition which he had before
rmed a righteousnesse perfect, and meritorious in its own wor-
yness to Justification? If this be not his meaning, then Master
xter eats up again to day what he spit out yesterday. But this
n in no wise befall the animosity of his spirit. If it be his mean-
g, then doth he pronounce even our legal righteousnes, which
nsists in the fulfilling of the Morall duties of the Moral Law,
well as our Evangelicall righteousnesse (as he termes the per-
nall righteousnesse which is conformed to the rule of the
ospel) to bee meritorious to Justification. And not any one of
e Popes themselves have spoken higher language then this, to
ine man in his own righteousnesse.

3. I would be informed, if the performance of the duties of
e Morall Law, in obedience to Christ doth justifie, why the

ſame performance in obedience to God, doth not juſtifie alſo? Is not obedience due as well to the Father, as to the Son? or is not Juſtification as much from the Father as from the Son? The ſame honour is due to both, and the ſame work of grace effected by both. Neither can I ſee any more worth in Morall Righteouſneſſe Morally performed (for I finde not Mr. Baxter as yet ſpeaking further of it) in obedience to the Son, then in the ſame done to the Father by way of obedience to him. But of this point we ſhall have a more proper place and occaſion to ſpeak more fully afterward.

2. Concerning the ſecond, that the Goſpel doth require but ſincere, not perfect obedience, I might alſo enquire,

1. Why Mr. *Baxter* doth here take it up *pro conceſſo*, for granted? He had indeed put it in the queſtion to which he is anſwering, but had ſaid nothing for the ſolution of it, except peradventure by the art of *Ventriloquie*, he ſpake ſomething under the Table, that he might not bee heard, when hee ſaid in his firſt anſwer to it, *That the Morall Law is continued by Chriſt in the ſenſe before expreſſed*, meaning by thoſe words, the expreſſions uſed in the ſaid queſtion, that under the New Covenant the Morall Law commandeth not perfect obedience, but onely ſincere, or at leaſt the Goſpel having the Morall Law for its preceptive part doth ſo. If I knew that to be his meaning, I have ſomewhat to ſay to it. In mean while, be it, or be it not his meaning, is every thing that Mr. *Baxter* hath once imagined in his brain, or ſpoken under a buſhel, by and by to be taken up for a granted principle in Religion, upon which he may make a ſuperſtructure of what he pleaſeth?

2. Why doth he not alledge thoſe Teſtimonies of the New Teſtament which aſſert onely a ſincere, and not a perfect obedience? Why doth hee ſuffer us poor ſoules to continue in darkneſſe for lack of his light communicated to us? Is it in the outſide, or the inſide of his Teſtament that this myſtical doctrine is contained? I acknowledge the promiſes of Gods free grace are made out in the riches thereof to them that are in Chriſt, that God for Chriſts ſake will accept their ſincere volitions, and performances, according to the ability which they have, and not reject them for want of the ability which they have not. That not onely the infirmities of their obedience, but their very ſins and diſobedience is blotted out, and ſhall be no more impu-

them,&c. But this in no wiſe denyeth perfect obedience to be eir duty ſtill. Yea much more their duty under the Goſpel, en under the Law, becauſe there is a greater obligation of eater, and more benefits upon them under the Goſpel then un- r the Law, binding them to yeeld back perfect love and obedi- ce to their Benefactor.

3. What ſhall we think of thoſe Texts in the New Teſtament, hich require of us *to be perfect*, 2 Cor. 13. 11. *Jam.* 1. 4. *Yea fect as God is perfect*, Mat. 5. 48. reproving weakneſs and in- mity, and commanding *a going on to perfection*, Heb. 6.1. as mpared with the precedent Chapter in the latter part thereof? a if perfection were not the duty of a Chriſtian, and unperfect- ſs and infirmity his ſin; why doth the Apoſtle ſo much *groan and ieve under the remainder of his naturall infirmities, and preſſe on perfection*? Rom. 7. 14, to the 24. *Phi.* 3. 12-14. Or is ſuch perfectneſs a ſinne onely in reference to the rule of the Law, d not the rule of the Goſpel; for that the Law doth, but the oſpel doth not call for perfection? This is both contrary to the riptures alleaged, and doth withall make the Goſpel to allow perfections. And (to uſe Mr. *Baxters* own expreſſions, which lleth the Goſpel a Law) what the Law forbids not, we take the me to be approved by that Law. If any ſhould ſay that the Go- l doth not require perfect, but ſincere obedience, *ad aliquid*, relation to this, or that particular end; it might in ſome caſe a truth. But Mr. *Baxter* layes it down poſitively in it ſelf, that e Goſpel requires not perfection. And this can in no wiſe be fended.

4. Is not this Doctrine a ſluce to let into the hearts of men a hole flood of carnal ſecurity, idleneſs, improficiency, contempt, neglect of all the means of growth in grace, each man ſetling mſelf upon his lees, with this Apology, that they are already nared to the minde and rule of the Goſpel, are ſincere, have truth and true being of Faith, knowledge, and obedience: is is all which the Goſpel requireth, they are even with the e, why ſhould they ſtreteh themſelves further to be beyond it? is is a brand which Mr. *Baxter* inureth upon our, or rather rifts doctrine of Juſtification by Faith alone. Is not himſelfe ilty?

5. I would be informed what he meanes by ſincere obedience. is very requiſite that hee which vends new Doctrines in new

termes

terms, ſhould be exquiſite in expreſſing, and explaining his terms and words. *Sincerus*, ſay the Etymologiſts, *eſt quaſi ſine cera*, as honey pure without the mixture of any wax in it. That which is moſt pure and ſimple, without any mixtures, or tinctures. And Sincerity is uſually put in oppoſition, 1 to hypocriſie, or 2 to corruption, or ſinful pollution. As ſincerity of obedience is put in oppoſition to that obedience which is done in hypocriſie, or with ſiniſter, and ſelf ends; ſo our Saviour denyes the ſincerity of the Scribes and Phariſees, and chargeth them frequently in the Goſpel with hypocriſie, for their ſtrict walking, devotions, almſdeeds, *&c.* that they might bee juſtified by ſuch perſonall righteouſneſs of their own. This hee calls hypocriſie, and denyes to be ſincere obedience, becauſe it aimed not ſimply to the glory of God, but to their own ends, their own juſtification. But this I take to be Mr. *Baxters* main end of obedience, to do it that we may bee juſtified by it. And then according to the doctrine of the Lord Chriſt, it is not ſincere, but hypocriticall obedience. Or if we take hypocriſie to conſiſt in profeſſing and practiſing holyneſs and obedience outwardly, but to baſe and worldly ends, lurking ſecretly in the heart, *viz.* profit, honour, applauſe, and praiſe of men, *&c.* which is there of the aliens from the Covenant of Grace, that cannot plead a ſincerity this way. *I have lived in all good conſcience before God unto this day*, ſaith *Paul* of himſelf, in reference to the time wherein he was yet a *Saul*, inſinuating the Morall ſincerity of his heart in oppoſition to hypocriſie and baſe ends in his obedience while hee was yet out of Chriſt. that even then he ſerved, and obeyed of good conſcience, and according to the meaſure of the light of Gods Word ſhining, as farre as it ſhined in his conſcience, *Act.* 23. 1. Yea hee did in ſincerity according to the dictate of his conſcience, whatſoever hee did even againſt Chriſt: *I thought verily, ſaith he, that I ought to do many things againſt the Name of Jeſus, &c. which things alſo I did*, Act. 26. 9, 10. It is that whereof the Apoſtle gives his teſtimony of the greateſt bulk of his kinred and Nation that rejected Chriſt, *They have a zeale of God, ſaith he*, &c. Rom. 10. 2. of God, therefore ſincere in oppoſition to baſe ends in all the ſervices which they performed; and a zeal; this importeth an high degree of their obedience, and ſincerity of obeying. Who is there of the carnal, and ignorant multitude, but can profeſſe the like ſin-

cerity

cerity in their publick worship, and private performances, without proposing to themselves any base and sinister ends therein? And doth the Gospel prescribe onely such a sincere obedience, which is attained without any Gospel, or Gospellizing of the heart? Or if we take sincerity in opposition to all mixture of the flesh and corruption, in our obedience; in this case the sincerity must be either perfect or unperfect: If perfect, then the Gospel requireth the most perfect obedience, contrary to the assertion of Mr. *Baxter*. For what can be more perfect then that which is pure, and free from all contamination of the flesh, wholly spirituall? But where is the man to bee found that can practically perform the duty? That Apostle which had laboured more abundantly then they all, professed himself not to have compassed it, but that in the purest and livelyest operations of the Spirit in him unto good, there was a counter-working of *the flesh in him, hindering the good which he willed, and turning it into the evill which he hated*, &c, *Rom.* 7.21-23. And the same he *professeth also to be the case of all other the Saints of God*, Gal. 5. 17. So that a perfect sincerity he cannot mean, both because he denyeth that the Gospel injoyneth perfect obedience, and perfection of sincerity in this kinde is the highest pitch of the perfection that is in the most perfect obedience: And withall because he tels us in the next answer, pag. 158. He knows not to what end Christ should command us that obdience, which he doth never enable any man in this life to perform. And this hee hath layd downe for a maxime, That whatsoever Christ hath commanded, or testified, if Mr. *Baxter* cannot find out, and fathom a good reason for it, and of it, meddle with it who listeth, he will have nothing to doe with it. Or if he mean an unperfect sincerity, that, according to Mr. *Baxter*, is none at all. For if the righteousnesse of our persons and actions bee, much more the sincerity of our righteousnesse and obedience must be, not a being, but a modification of a being, which doth not admit of *magis* and *minus*, but must be perfect, or none at all. Yea what an absurdity is it to affirm, that he, whose office it is to perfect his Elect, *Heb.* 10.14 that doth not only begin but finish his good work in them, hath commanded that which is unperfect? Hee may be truly said to wink at our unperfectnes, to forgive our imperfections; but to say he commands that which is unperfect, is to deny the perfection of his commands, and so to lay imperfection to his charge, as

well as to our own. Beſides he may according to his cuſtom, if he be put to tell us what ſincerity he means, fall to diſtinguiſh it into a Phyſical, or Metaphyſicall ſincerity, into a Morall, and an Evangelical ſincerity, ſo that although wee find many of his Meaſhes, yet ſhall we never find his Fourm: So full of doubles, and falſe leaps are they that deale not ſincerely in handling the doctrine of Chriſt, ſwaying and waving it hither and thither, to make it not ſubſervient to the advancing of Chriſts kingdom, but of their own inventions. Let Mr. *Baxter* labour rather practically, and feelingly to know the power of Chriſtian, and ſpiritual ſincerity within his heart, then to make uſe of the Word to make intricate the plain doctrine of Scriptures, and hencefoorth we ſhall finde that which we have hitherto unſucceſſefully ſought after, ſincere dealing in his diſputes. It is not all this while denyed, that the Goſpel requires ſincere obedience, but affirmed, that it calls for both ſincere, and perfect obedience.

I much doubt I ſhould ſlander Mr. *Baxter*, if I ſhould ſay that hee means by ſincere obedience, ſincerely Evangelical obedience. For hee will not bee known to know what that is. It is beſides the Orb of Philoſophers, Scholaſticks, and Sophiſters, in which he moveth. But if beyond our beleef he meane ſo, then I ſhall conſent, and ſpeak with him, *When the New Covenant ſaith, Thou ſhalt obey ſincerely*, i. e. purely, according to the Goſpel rule, which teacheth us to fetch all our guidance, in every work of obedience to make it Evangelical, from the Word of Chriſt; all our ſtrength to doe it from the Spirit of Chriſt, all our acceptance from our union to Chriſt, preſenting all, and our ſelves withall to God, through the mediation of Chriſt, doing all not to attain Juſtification by all done, but to glorifie God with the fruits of our thankfulneſs, for the prizeleſſe gift of Juſtification conferred upon us in, and through Chriſt. When the New Covenant (I ſay) hath taught us to obey in a ſincerely Evangelicall manner; here now the Moral Law ſteps in, and tels us (as Mr. *Baxter* ſaith) wherein, and what we muſt endeavour to doe, *i.e.* What be thoſe duties of Moral holyneſs, and righteouſnes, which being in this Goſpel way performed, doe receive a higher title then Moral, and become Evangelical, Chriſtian, and ſpiritual obeying. If Mr. *Baxter* mean, or will mean thus, we will go hand in hand with him, or (what ſhall be more proper) give him his due precedency, and follow him.

The

The next anſwer (put in numb. 4.) whether it be alſo an anſwer to this ſecond Queſtion, or intended as an anſwer to the third Queſtion (which elſe paſſeth without anſwer) or elſe to both queſtions; runs in theſe words.

B. *But that the Moral Law, without reſpect to either Covenant, ſhould command us perfect obedience; or that Chriſt as the Mediator of the New Covenant ſhould command us, not onely ſincere, but alſo perfect obedience to the Morall Law, and ſo hath made it a proper part of his Goſpel, not onely as a directory, and inſtruction, but alſo as a command: I am not yet convinced, (though I will not contend with any that think otherwiſe.) My reaſon is, becauſe I know not to what end Chriſt ſhould command us that obedience, which hee never doth enable any man in this life to performe. If it were to convince us of our diſability and ſinne: That is the worke of the Law; and the continuing of it upon the old terms, as is before explained, is ſufficient to that.*

But I judge this queſtion to be of greater difficulty than moment.

The multiplication of nice and unneceſſary queſtions hath been one ſpecial means to bring a darkneſs upon the doctrine of the Word in thoſe parts thereof, that in themſelves are clear and full of light. It ſufficeth me to know, what hath been a little before proved, that the Moral Law, both with reſpect, and as conſidered in it ſelf, without reſpect to either Covenant, hath been ever, is, and ſhall be ever the perfect rule and directory of Moral obedience; And that Chriſt, as the Mediator of the New Covenant, hath not diſſolved, or made voyd any part of the Morall Law, or of the Righteouſneſs and duty which the Moral Law requireth, in reference to either the ſincerity or perfection in performing the ſame; but contrariwiſe hath avouched the contrary, and denounced, that *whoſoever ſhall break one of the leaſt of theſe commandements, and teach men ſo; i. e.* as I conceive, ſhall take liberty by the abuſe, and miſunderſtanding of the New Covenant to neglect, or be remiſs in any part or degree of that righteouſneſs which the Law requireth, and teach others the ſame remiſneſſe alſo, *The ſame ſhall be leaſt in the kingdom of heaven*, i. e. A uſeleſs and unprofitable Teacher in the Gospel

Church. This ſufficeth me to know, and this the Scripture plainly affirmeth and fully confirmeth. *Mat.* 5. 17. 19.

But whether the Moral Law to them that are under the New Covenant, and truly in Chriſt, be onely a rule and directory, or elſe a commander alſo? Or whether Chriſt hath made the Moral Law a proper part of his Goſpel, theſe are things Heterogeneous from the former, and firſt deviſed by thoſe diſtinctionary Sophiſters that to ſtrengthen their doctrine of merits and works of ſuperogation, have diſtinguiſhed between the precepts and counſels of Chriſt. Sure I am, that the Goſpel in its ſtrict and proper ſenſe, conſiſts not at all in bringing precepts, but life, grace, righteouſneſs, peace, joy, holineſs, liberty, and ſalvation from heaven, and whatſoever elſe tendeth to the perfect and never ending welbeing of poor ſouls, together with an alſufficient light and direction how to attain all theſe, and manage them being attained, to the advancing of the glory of the grace of the giver. This is properly the ſumme of the Goſpel, and the precepts intermixed with the doctrine hereof, no otherwiſe proper to the Goſpel, than as they are furtherances to the attainment of them, and lights and helps to direct us how to ſtand fixed in the enjoyment of them, and walk holily, honourably and worthily in the ſtrength and comfort of them. Yet it cannot bee denyed but that ſtill the Law Moral is a perfect rule of all perfect Moral righteouſneſſe; and that Chriſt hath expunged no part of it, but commands all, yea writes the righteouſneſſe of all in the hearts of beleevers, that they might will all, and delight to do all, not onely after the Moral, but after the Evangelical rule, through Chriſt, for whoſe ſake their unperfect ſervices are accepted with God as though they were full and compleat. This hath been cleared before in our examination of Maſter *Baxters* ſecond Anſwer to the ſecond Queſtion, and expreſs Scriptures alleadged for confirmation thereof. Neither can wee think that the many infinite benefits freely conferred in the way of the Goſpel upon us, do exempt us from, but are obligations upon us unto the fulfilling of all righteouſneſs: or that it is our bondage, but our liberty to be *free from ſinne, and the ſervants of righteouſneſſe*. The nature of the commands being now altered under the Covenant of Grace, from what they were under the Covenant of workes. Then they proceeded from meer ſoveraignty and power, now from tender Grace and Love. Then had they a ſting in

the

tayle, the curse and hell to inflict, in case there were not full
formance. This sting and curse is now carried away in the
y of Christ, no threat of it to them that are in Christ, but the
ng commanded for the compleating of our perfection, which
sists in our conformity with the will and nature of God, with
dammage annexed, that the lesse perfectly we perform, the
er off we are yet from our desired perfection. There the
d commanded his servants, here the father his dear Children.
ere man was commanded to work in his own strength, here
treasury of Christ is opened, and the power of his Spirit of-
d, and we commanded to receive our fill, and in the strength
what we receive, to mount higher and higher untill we come
full perfection.

The reason that Master *Baxter* bringeth *why he cannot bee yet convinced that Christ commands perfect obedience to the Moral Law*, re from another reasonless, but from Master *Faxter* it is but a scovery of himselfe to be himselfe *i. e.* an admirer (I had al-st said adorer) of his own wisdome. *Because* (saith he) *I w not to what end Christ should command us that obedience which never doth enable any man in this life to performe.* What more y arrogance? he must be admitted into Christs privie Coun-l, and have communicated to him what ends Christ hath in ving his commands, else will he cast behinde him his precepts void and vain. He should have left to *Socinus* and his follow-s thus to have argued, who make humane reason the rule and und of their Religion. Had he said, he is not yet convinced, cause he yet meets not with any punctual testimony of Scrip-re that expressly affirms it, this would have at the worst but pplyed some inadvertency in his reading the Scriptures. But t to deny that the Scripture saith it, and yet not to be convin-d, because he seeth not to what ends Christ should doe what e Scripture saith he hath done; this is no lesse than the ad-ancing the authority of his reason above the authority of Gods ord: and an attributing of power to his own blindnesse, of lencing and frustrating the authority and truth of the Scrip-ures.

But who is more blinde than he that will not see? Or what hin-ers Master *Baxter* from seeing what ends Christ had in com-anding that perfection which we cannot attain in this life ful-y to performe? Is it not because he terminateth and boundeth

Christs ends in all that he did, suffered or commanded, to make as both the circumference and center of all, and had no aim to his own glory, and the glory of his father that sent him, therein? How many honourable ends of Christ in this case may there be gathered from the Scriptures.

1. That God might be herein glorified. *Herein is my father glorysied, that ye bear much fruit.* Jo. 15. 8. The more fruit we bear, and the more perfect, the more is God glorified in us. Therefore is the perfection of our fruit-bearing commanded, that God may be still more and more glorified by our greater & greater fruitfulnesse; every one being forced to magnify the wonderfull operation of Gods grace in Christ, that hath enabled that which was erewhile a dead stock, to bring forth against nature so much and so good fruit. Even as an expert penman, or Master in writing, to get honour by the proficiency of his Scholler, doth not bring down, and lessen the perfection of his letters which he writes for their coppy, to their feebleneſse and unableneſse in writing, (so should they continue unskilfull and unable still) but sets before them a perfect coppy, commanding and teaching them to follow it, and by degrees even to match it; and by this means the more perfectly they write, the more honour comes to the Master.

2. To hold us in a constant intercourse and communion with himselfe by faith. Were we perfect, or had we attained all that is required of us, we should be wholly apt to settle our selves upon our own bottoms, and worke either not at all, or else in our strength. But when we see our selves deficient in what we ought to be, and nothing in our selves, or any where else, out of Christ to supply us, that *without, or out of him we can doe nothing*, this keeps us in a diligent and constant union with him, to abide in him as the branches in the vine, to suck from him sap and life more abundantly for the producing of more abundant growth and fruitfulnesse in us: and thus the communion beeween Christ and us is more and more perfected, and he more and more honoured, when we fetch all our vertue and strength from him.

3. To keep us in continual selfe-denyal, and to dash to nothing Master *Baxters* idol of Justification by our own inherent righteousnesse; which when we finde to come still short of the perfection injoyned, and sinfull in its defectiveneſse, we shall be forced to with-hold our confidence from it, and with the Apostle

ſtle to ſhake it off (in reference to Juſtification) *as dung and e, that we may win Chriſt, and be found in him &c.* So making rift our *All*, and our ſelves nothing to our own happineſſe, i. 3. 8. 9.

4. To awaken us out of our carnal ſlumberings, and contenion in our poor beginings and ſlight pittances of knowledge d righteouſneſſe already attained, and to ſtirre us on with a ly agility towards perfection, in our motions. It was this t wrought thus with the Apoſtle *Paul*. Knowing perfection be commanded, and ſeeing himſelfe yet in a ſtation ſo ſhort of it makes him to cry out, *I have not yet attained, I am not yet per-*, [therefore] *forgetting thoſe things that are behind, that are al-dy* done and attained, *and reaching forth to the things that are ore*, not yet attained, *I preſſe toward the marke*, [of perfection.] il. 3. 12, 13, 14.

For theſe and many other ends (that might bee added) doth rift command perfection, though not fully attainable in this .

Maſter *Baxter* expreſſes himſelfe to be able to finde but one, d that but a ſeeming end or reaſon in this caſe, and that hee owes off as inſufficient. *If it were* (ſaith he) *to convince us of r diſability and ſinne, that is the worke of the Law*; *and the con-ing of it upon the old termes, as is before explained, is ſufficient to t.* Sundry failings are there in this paſſage of his, making inſufficient to the end for which he uſeth it.

1. That it makes the Law, becauſe it convinceth of ſinne, to the onely means ordained of God to convince us of ſinne. hen contrariwiſe the Lord Chriſt tells us, that *the Spirit of ace ſhall, under the Goſpel alſo, convince men of ſinne, Joh.* 16. 8. d that with a more effectual conviction than ever the Law, as e Law, could work. It ſhall ſo convince men of ſinne, that it ll convince them of righteouſneſſe alſo, of damning ſinne in emſelves, and of ſaving righteouſneſſe laid up for them in rift. This the Law could not do; Therefore is as a Cove-nt of workes (for ſo Maſter *Baxter* here takes the Law,) neither e onely, nor the chiefe means ordained of God to convince of ne.

2. That it makes the Law, upon its old terms, to be ordained God, in a ſpecial and proper manner to convince of ſinne. is indeed was the office of the Law, as given to *Iſrael* upon mount

mount *Sinai*, upon other and new termes: But upon its old
first terms as it was given to *Adam*, this could not be the
and proper end of the Moral Law. For *Adam* received it w
he was yet innocent and without sinne, and in that state of
the Law could not convince him, was not appointed to convi
him of sinne, having not all sinned.

3. That it makes the Law upon its old terms, *i.e.* (accord
to Master *Baxter*) as a Covenant of works, sufficient by it
to conviction, without any need of Gospel convictions to be
sed. When contrariwise all the convictions of the Law so
sidered can worke but desperation and death in the convi
They are the convictions of the Gospel, and Spirit of G
working by the Gospel, that are effectual to conversion
life.

For conclusion he saith,

B. *But I judge the question to be of more difficulty than
ment.*

And I answer, that the difficulty of the question is not f
the Word of God, but from him and his fellowes, which fill w
knots hard to be loosed, the leading thread which Christ h
given us all displayed. As for the Moment of the question,
him crack at his pleasure among fooles; yet the wise must n
see and acknowledge it such, as if he lose it, he loseth one of
chief pillars (though it be but a paper pillar) to bear up m
personal righteousnesse to justification. For if it be proved t
Christ requireth perfect obedience under the Gospel, down f
all the perfection, meritoriousnesse and efficacy of mans righ
teousnesse to Justification. And so he must begin all again, a
fit himselfe with better pillars next, if any where from *Rom
Jury* they are to be had, this proving rotten and unuseful. T
obedience which in relation to both Covenants, to Law
Gospel too, is similiy unperfect, cannot bee of any power
Justifie.

CHAP

Chap. XIX.

Arg. *Whether Christ hath satisfied for sinnes against the Old Covenant, and not for sinnes against the New also.*

Thes. 32, 33, 34, 35.

UNto this I may ad the *quodlibetarie & quidlibetarie doctrines* of Mr *Baxter*, his *Niceties*, *quiddities*, and nimble nothings, whereof he disputes profoundly in the four next Theses, *viz.* the 32 &c. and in his *Appendix*, in answer to the third question, pag. 32. of the appendix, and thence to pag. 27. in which many noble and rare speculations are unfolded. *viz.*

1. Whether the rope wherewith *Judas* hanged himselfe, were made of hair or hemp?

2. Whether it were *Simon*, *alias* called *Peter*, or *Peter*, *alias* called *Simon*, that denyed Christ; and whether it were *Pontius*, or else *Pilate* that condemned him.

3. Whether it were Christs Crosse, or else the Crosse of Christ that *Simon* of *Cyrene* was compelled to bear? Item whether hee carried it on his right or his left shoulder? and which end of the Crosse was before, and whether the contrary end were behind in carriage?

4. Whether when *Joab* was put to death for killing two men, *Abner* and *Amasa*, for which of these two murthers he suffered, for the former or the latter, or for neither?

The same or like to these are the disputes of Master *Baxter*, in these Theses and their explications, and in the forementioned part of the Appendix. *viz.* 1. Whether, when himselfe hath laid it down for a position no lesse firm and unrepealable than the Lawes of the *Medes* and *Persians* which alter not, that there is no sinne prohibited in the Gospel, which is not a breach of some precept of the Decalogue, and a sinne against the Old Covenant, &c. Yet nevertheless there be any sinnes against the New Covenant which are not also against the Old? Item whether there be any sinnes, considerable in any of their respects against the Gospel onely, and not against the Moral Law? and then consequently, whether Christ hath satisfied by his death for such sinnes as himself affirmes never have been, never shall be, or can be committed. *Thes.* 30. pag. 148. that is, for imaginary

ſins which never were ſins, nor ſhall be? *Theſ.* 32.

2. When he hath aſſerted, and peremptorily concluded, *Theſ.* 32. That Chriſt was not to ſatisfie for any ſin committed againſt the New Covenant, which was not, is not alſo a ſin againſt the Old. Yet whether it be not very needfull to be queſtioned in the 32 Theſ. Whether Chriſt hath done, what he was not to doe? whether he hath ſatisfied for ſins that violated the New Covenant as well as for thoſe that violate the Old Covenant? And conſequently if he ſhould have ſo done, whether this were to have been reckoned as a work of ſupererogation above, and beyond his duty to have merited ſuperexcedently for us; or an act of ſin againſt his duty, putting him into an incapacity to merit at all for us? yea whereas Mr. *Baxter* concludeth abſolutely as an undeniable truth, *Theſ.* 32. *Therefore Chriſt dyed not for any ſin againſt the Goſpel, or Covenant of Grace*, whether that be not a ſufficient argument to prove in *Theſ.* 33. that Chriſt hath not by his paſſive obedience ſatisfied for the ſinnes that violate the Covenant of Grace? who can evade the force of ſuch an argument, Chriſt hath not ſatisfied, *ergo* he hath not ſatisfied; ſpecially when it hath been before proved in words at length, that there is no ſin againſt the New Covenant, but is a ſin againſt the Old alſo; and it is ſatisfied for, as to the Old Covenant, what reaſon is there then that it ſhould bee ſatisfied, as to the New Covenant too? When the Creditor is payd his full debt in the hall, and hath yeelded up the bond, will he expect to have the ſame debt payd to him in the parlor alſo?

3. Whether, when both Law and Goſpel, Old, and New Covenant, command the ſame thing; that Chriſt then ſatisfieth for the breach of that duty, as to the Law, but not as to the Goſpel? The Goſpel then damneth men for that fault that in reference to the Law is ſatisfied for? and conſequently many poor wretches are damned by the Goſpel, and New Covenant, which by the Law, and Old Covenant ſhould be ſaved? Or if it be not ſo, whether then it be not the Law that damneth even for all unbelief it ſelf, taking advantage from the violating of the grace of the New Covenant, to aggravate their condemnation, that under the means of Grace have lived, and dyed contemners thereof?

4. Whether all other ſinnes which the Goſpel precepts do prohibit, be againſt Chriſt and his Goſpel, as the object of thoſe ſins

s, onely the breaking of the conditions of the Goſpel, be not a
againſt Chriſt and his Goſpel, as the object of that ſin? for
Mr. *Baxter* pag. 159. diſtinguiſheth between thoſe ſinnes that
ve Chriſt, and the Goſpel for their object, and thoſe breaches
the conditions of the New Covenant, as if theſe had not
hriſt and his Goſpel for their object. What then is the object
theſe ſins? or have they no object? or how many thouſand
nditions of the New Covenant are there, the breach where-
is by no ſacrifice to be purged? Hee tells us indeed, *Theſ.*
. pag. 159. *that the Goſpel threatneth death to no other
, but finall unbelief and rebellion.* But this finall unbelief, and
all rebellion hath its belly ſo full of other ſmall ſins threatned
the womb of their Mother, [*Rebellion*] as ever a man found of
e berries in the belly of a breeding Lobſter. And in his Ap-
ndix, pag. 23. he makes finall unbelief the *genus*, to which he
tributes but three ſpecies, of which the firſt, *viz.* Ordinary fi-
ll unbelief, is not to bee conſidered as *ſpecies ſpecialiſſima*, but
balterna, which being looked upon as a *genus*, hath ſo many
ecies, or as a *ſpecies* hath ſo many *individuals* under it (accord-
g to Mr. *Baxters* doctrine) as the beſt Arithmetician in the
orld, ſaving himſelfe, will not dare to yeeld up, upon his caſt-
g, the true ſumme of them to ſatisfie Mr. *Baxters* cenſure there-
; as it will appear when Mr. *Baxter* comes to unlace, and rip
broad his Juſtifying Faith in its largeſt ſenſe. *Theſ.* 70.

To theſe I might adde many more quaintiſies of the ſame
ature, breathing out themſelves from the veins of this his diſ-
ute. But all the reſt, as thoſe already mentioned, are but tarry-
g irons to take up the time of men that are *Malè feriati*, rather
ve to play with the buttons, then to cloſe with the body, and
rink in the ſpirit of true Chriſtianity. And what other end can
r. *Baxter* have in theſe his chippings and mincings, but to ſhew
e delicacy of his wit? Whom hath he in the ſubſtance of what
ſpeaketh, his adverſary? We grant and teach with him.

1. That there is no ſin prohibited by the Goſpel, or New Cove-
ant, which is not a ſin againſt the Law, and Old Covenant alſo.

2. That finall unbelief, and rebellion, are ſins (if not unpar-
onable) as if they exceeded the bounds of Gods grace, and
hriſts merits to pardon them, yet) which have no futurition of
ardon, ſhall never be pardoned in this life, or in that which is to
ome: For ſo hath the Lord declared his purpoſe in reference to
heſe ſins.

3. That both the Law and the Gospel concurre in damning such persons; the Law as a Covenant of Workes properly, for their refusall to submit (even till death it self) to the will and authority of God, requiring Faith in Christ for their redemption from vengeance. The Gospel improperly, by withholding its shelter from the Laws sentence against them, because they would never be perswaded to come under the shelter of it: yea more in strengthning the hand of the Law to give them the sorer punishment, for the contempt of Gods grace, as well as of his Authority and Justice. And thus not onely the mountains of their sinnes against the Law, but also Christ the Rock shall fall upon them to their greater shivering, for that they dared to dash themselves against him, and would not be induced to be built against all the stroakes of vengeance upon him.

This is the summe of all that which Mr. *Baxter* here in substance saies. To what purpose then are his elaborate distinctions of the differing respects and aspects, senses and non-senses, in which Christ hath either satisfied, or not satisfied for mans sin, unlesse it be *Balaam*-like, to lay a stumbling block in the way of the simpler people of Gods *Israel*, to occasion their fall? to puzzle their judgements and consciences? and to make the way of grace, which is in it self as discovered by the Lord Christ, easie and plaine, to be unto them by his evill working therein, intricate, perplexed, and full of snares? To all sober men it sufficeth to know,

1. That there is no one of their sins, in whatsoever consideration it be taken, but hath death and hell in the tayl of it.

2. That there cannot be any other way of exemption from the death & hel which every such sin of theirs meriteth, by any other meanes but by the redemption which is by, and in the Lord Jesus.

3. That the blood of Christ hath in it a perfect efficacy to cleanse from all sin whatsoever, no one excepted, if it be applyed to cleanse; Not the very sin against the Holy Ghost, which hath not power totally to purge out from the conscience, if it were truly applyed. But therefore is that sin never pardoned, nor purged from the soul, because the Spirit of God never doth, nor will apply the blood of Christ to the soul that is guilty of it, nor generates Faith in such a soul to run unto, and wash in the Fountain of Christs blood, that it may be clean. Let there be an

one sin named of all the sins whereof our corrupt nature is preg-nant, that is so much a sin against the Gospel, but that the pur-ging, or not purging away of it, the absolving of the conscience from it, or retaining of it upon the conscience, doth not wholly depend upon the application, or not application of the blood of Christ to the soul, and I shall acknowledge that I have seen but the Letter, and was never yet acquainted with the Spirit, and drift of the Scriptures.

Or suppose we should take a delight to contend about that which is a meer *lana caprina*, whether it be hair or wooll that grows upon the Goats shoulders, how feeble might we manifest the reasons to be which Mr. *Baxter* bringeth to prove, that the sins against the New Covenant are not satisfied for, by the sacrifice of Christs death.

As 1. When the Apostle affirmeth *Christ to have suffered death for the redemption of the transgressions under the first Testament*, Heb. 9. 15. Doth it follow thence that he hath not redeemed from the transgressions against the New Covenant also? If I say that Christ forgave to *Peter*, or *Paul*, or *Mary Magdalen* all their sins committed before conversion, do I thereby as much as im-ply that he retains still, and revengeth upon them all the sinnes they committed after they were converted? Or should one of Mr. *Baxters* acquaintance say, that whatsoever Mr. *Baxter* preached, and wrote, untill four or five years since, was good, and Ortho-dox, doth it follow that all that he hath since preached, and writ-ten, is heretical, and erroneous? Nay the purpose of the Apostle here is to convince the *Hebrews* that sought in part for righte-ousnesse by the Law, or Old Testament, that it could not make its observers perfect: For Christ dyed to redeem the transgres-sions of them that were under the first Covenant, which he need-ed not to have done, if all the Sacrifices under the Law could have purged them. And thus the Morall Law is not here at all opposed to the Gospel, that the Gospel, or New Covenant doe purge the sinnes onely that were committed under, and against the Morall Law, because all the righteousnesse of the Morall Law could not purge them; but the sacrifice of Christ, the Me-diator of the New Covenant, is here opposed to the Levitical sacrifices under the Legall Covenant. What these could not, the sacrifice of Christ hath expiated.

2. Where he tels us, that *Christ could not satisfie for sinnes commit-*

ted against the New Covenant, because the New Covenant threatens no death to such sinnes, therefore no need if Christs mediating death here for us: For where no death is threatned, there is none explicitely due, saith he. But will he say none is either explicitely, or implicitely due? Or when Mr. *Baxter* tels us pag. 15. that in the Old Covenant *the promise of life is not expressed, but plainly implyed in the threatning of death*: Will it not follow by the same reasons, that when Mr. *Baxter* in the after part of this his Treatate alleageth such multitudes of Scriptures, that promise life to the performance of such and such acts of Gospel righteousnesse, that there is implyed the threat of death against the non-performance of the same? Or if it should have been printed (as is most probable, because he so speaketh elsewhere in reference to the covenants) that where death is not explicitely threatned, there it is not due, and Christ hath not suffered it in our behalfe. What shall we think then of all the fathers from *Adam* to *Moses*, where was this death explicitely threatned to any actual sinne, untill the Law was given by *Moses*? The Scripture mentions it not, and Mr. *Baxter* hath told us (though I doubt somewhat rashly, and Magisterially) that *to Adam himself in his perfection the form of the Covenant was not known* (as written in his heart) *but by superadded revelation*, pag. 14. Yea what shall we say of all the Nations of the world (*Israel* alone excepted) that even untill Christ, had no revealed Covenant with God, much lesse death threatned explicitely by such a Covenant? Will Mr. *Baxter* deny death to have been due to them for their sinnes, because not explicitely threatned? Doth not the Apostle, *Rom.* 1. 32. *& alibi*, affirm the contrary? Thus if it were; but it is not proved, that the New Testament doth not so threaten death.

3. When he tels us that *Christ is said to have been made under the Law, and to have born the curse of the Law, and to have freed us from it, but no where is this affirmed of him, in respect of the Gospel*, pag. 161. This is an Argument of the same nature with that before, from *Heb.* 9. 15. The Apostle to dash the crest of their self-confidence, in seeking to be in part justified (as Mr. *Baxter* also doth) by their own personall righteousnesse done in conformity to the Law, tels them that even the *Israel* of God, that were priviledged above all other people with a Law of Righteousnes, were under the curse of the Law, and could not be saved but by a Redeemer; much lesse they that had

ad not the help of such a Law. It bears the same sense with that f *Gal.* 2. 15, 16. *We that are Jews by nature, and not sinners of he Gentiles, Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the aw, but by the Faith of Jesus Christ, even we have beleeved in Jesus hrist that we may be justified, &c.* What a monstrous delusion ere it then for us to teach the sinners of the Gentiles to seek af- r Justification by their personal righteousness, according to the aw. And though it be no where, *totidem verbis, said, or affirmed him in respect of the Gospel*, yet is it said in the words equiva- nt, *Heb* 9.15. That he is the Mediator of the New Testament: hence *Pareus* on the place concludeth, *That if he hath satisfied r the sins against the Old, much more for the sinnes against the New estament, seeing he is the Mediator of this, not of that. And the lood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sinne*, 1 Joh. 1. 7. *Ergo* om sins also against the Gospel. I cannot say from sinns which e onely against the Gospel, for there are none such. Or if Mr. *axter* will take the words so strictly as hee seems to take them, at Christ hath redeemed onely from sins against the Law, hee ust exclude himself, with all the Churches and Saints of the entiles that are, or have been, from the redemption which is by hrist; for so then must that passage in *Gal.* 4.4,5. be read; *Christ as made under the Law to redeem them* [*onely*] *that were under the aw. i. e.* Only the Jews, for they onely were under the Law of *loses*, and of this Law Mr. *Baxter* must needs confess the Apostle re to speak. So that this argument of his, if it please not a Jew, will please no body.

4. The last Argument which he brings in the same 161 pag. hit the white, and cleave the pin, and resolve the question so nanswerably, that no tongue which cannot speak may ever more tter, or mutter against it, is as streight with his purpose, as a ms horn with a line. 4. *But the question is out of doubt*, (saith he) *cause that every man that performeth not the Gospel-conditions, doth ar the punishment himself in eternall fire, and therefore Christ did t bear it.* True, for Christ did bear the punishment of none of is sins, neither of his lying, swearing, lust, murther, drunkennesse, d other sins against the Law, but he shall bear all himself: shall e therefore conclude that Christ dyed not to make satisfaction r those sinnes in reference to them that have part in his death? his were to pronounce Christ to have satisfied for no sin at all, ther against Law or Gospel, and so no flesh shall be saved, but suffer in eternal fire.

5. What

5. What is in this Argument, as also in the two next, and immediately put before this, in the same 161 pag. of his Saint conditions which he worshipeth as his Mediators to bring him into communion with Christ, no less then he doth Christ himself to bring him into communion with God, I have partly spoken to before, and shall have large, and frequent occasion to speak more fully and largely upon other parts of this Tenet of Mr. *Baxter*; here he doth but name conditions in general, and what he saith is not worthy of any particular Animadversions in relation to it.

He confesseth himself pag. 160. *To have been long of another judgement in this point, while he considered not the tenor of the Covenants distinctly*: That is, as long as he derived his guidance therein from the Scripture it self, and from the truly Evangelical, and Orthodox Commentators thereon. But since hee hath met with Apocryphal Doctors, the Jesuits, and other nimble braines among the Papists, and with *Grotius*, and *Vossius*, and others of that hair, which have divided their consciences between the Papists and Socinians, little prizing the Word, where some quaint wit and invention of man hath not descanted upon it to make it shine in the paint and varnish of humane speculations and art: Now having found a Cuckows egge in a Finches nest, the man is so taken with the pretty conveyance, that he doth as it were nest himselfe by it, and accounts all other contemplations base in comparison of this, defies Eagles, Swans, Turtles, yea the whole generation of other birds; cares not what becomes of them all, so that this one may come to maturity, and prosper, because his fancy hath made it his own (as it were though (as it is much to be feared) to the perverting, if not total loss of himself and others; He having ascribed perfection and merit to it already, as fully as any of the most professed Papists. See how he flaunts and glories in this imaginary peece of Huperephaneous learning (in the 20,21,22. pages of his Appendix) as if he had not received it from men, but *Mahomet* from a celestial Dove, or by the Angel *Gabriel* from heaven, insulting not over the Antinomians, but over their adversaries also, (as he terms them) *i. e.* all the Orthodox Divines of all the Reformed Churches, scarce abstaining from cursing their ignorance in this phantasticall mystery so revealed to him; who contrariwise himself hath received the substance of it (if it

leed there were a new ſubſtance in it) from the Papiſts, and himſelf hath but licked it Bear-like, into a form of words beſt pleaſing his own imagination. The vanity of it will in its due place be diſcovered.

CHAP. XX.

Arg. *Beſides other leſſer things firſt, the chief thing about which this Chapter is occupant, is to diſcover the judgement of Proteſtant VVriters about Juſtification, as an eternal, and immanent Act in God, and how far it is grounded upon Scripture.*

Theſ. 36. pag. 166.

B. *The pardoning of ſinne is a gracious Act of God, diſcharging the offender by the Goſpel promiſe, or grant, from the obligation to puniſhment, upon conſideration of the ſatisfaction made by Chriſt, accepted by the ſinner, and pleaded with God.*

I mean not here to fall upon a diſpute with Mr. *Baxter*, whether (according to Mr. *Baxter* himſelf) the pardoning of ſinne through Chriſt, and Juſtification through Chriſt be not one, and the ſame thing: And whether he himſelf doth not pag. 208. acknowledge ſo much? Indeed pag. 186, he ſaith, that *Pardon of ſin, and juſtification in law, are not punctually, and preciſely all one. Yet adeth, that the difference is very ſmall, lying chiefly in this, that the* terminus à quo *of Remiſſion is the obligation to puniſhment, but the* terminus *of Juſtification (or the evill) that it formaly, and directly frees us from, is the Laws accuſation and condemnation. Here* (ſaith he) *though the difference be very narrow, yet a plain difference there is.* How plain? Can the blind man ſee it? Yea as well as he that hath both his eyes; for it is reſpective rather then reall. But how doth the difference lye in the different *termini à quibus*, remiſſion of ſins, and Juſtification free us? becauſe Mr. *Baxter* (a more curious cum-min-cutter in Logical diſputes then he that *Ariſtotle* in his Ethicks ſpeaks of, was in dividing of ſecular goods) hath thus cloven the hair into two even rafters, and ſo hath himſelf layd the difference, giving the one rafter for remiſſion of ſins,

5. What is in this Argument, as alſo in the two next, and immediately put before this, in the ſame 161 pag. of his Saint conditions which he worſhipeth as his Mediators to bring him into communion with Chriſt, no leſs then he doth Chriſt himſelf to bring him into communion with God, I have partly ſpoken to before, and ſhall have large, and frequent occaſion to ſpeak more fully and largely upon other parts of this Treatiſe of Mr. *Baxter*; here he doth but name conditions in general, and what he ſaith is not worthy of any particular Animadverſions in relation to it.

He confeſſeth himſelf pag. 160. *To have been long of another judgement in this point, while he conſidered not the tenor of the Covenants diſtinctly*: That is, as long as he derived his guidance therein from the Scripture it ſelf, and from the truly Evangelical, and Orthodox Commentators thereon. But ſince hee hath met with Apocryphal Doctors, the Jeſuits, and other nimble braines among the Papiſts, and with *Grotius*, and *Voſſius*, and others of that hair, which have divided their conſciences between the Papiſts and Socinians, little prizing the Word, when ſome quaint wit and invention of man hath not deſcanted upon it to make it ſhine in the paint and varniſh of humane ſpeculations and art: Now having found a Cuckows egge in a Finches neſt, the man is ſo taken with the pretty conveyance, that he doth as it were neſt himſelfe by it, and accounts all other contemplations baſe in compariſon of this, defies Eagles, Swans, Turtles, yea the whole generation of other birds; cares not what becomes of them all, ſo that this one may come to maturity, and proſper, becauſe his fancy hath made it his own (as it were though (as it is much to be feared) to the perverting, if not total loſs of himſelf and others; He having aſcribed perfection and merit to it already, as fully as any of the moſt profeſſed Papiſts. See how he flaunts and glories in this imaginary peece of Huperephaneous learning (in the 20, 21, 22. pages of his Appendix) as if he had not received it from men, but *Mahomet* had from a celeſtial Dove, or by the Angel *Gabriel* from heaven, inſulting not over the Antinomians, but over their adverſaries alſo, (as he terms them) *i. e.* all the Orthodox Divines of all the Reformed Churches, ſcarce abſtaining from curſing their ignorance in this phantaſticall myſtery ſo revealed to him; when contrariwiſe himſelf hath received the ſubſtance of it (if it

leed there were a new ſubſtance in it) from the Papiſts, and himſelf hath but licked it Bear-like, into a form of words beſt pleaſing his own imagination. The vanity of it will in its due place be diſcovered.

CHAP. XX.

Arg. *Beſides other leſſer things firſt, the chief thing about which this Chapter is occupant, is to diſcover the judgement of Proteſtant Writers about Juſtification, as an eternal, and immanent Act in God, and how far it is grounded upon Scripture.*

Theſ. 36. pag. 166.

B. *The pardoning of ſinne is a gracious Act of God, diſcharging the offender by the Goſpel promiſe, or grant, from the obligation to puniſhment, upon conſideration of the ſatisfaction made by Chriſt, accepted by the ſinner, and pleaded with God.*

I mean not here to fall upon a diſpute with Mr. *Baxter*, whether (according to Mr. *Baxter* himſelf) the pardoning of ſinne through Chriſt, and Juſtification through Chriſt be not one, and the ſame thing: And whether he himſelf doth not pag. 208. acknowledge ſo much? Indeed pag. 186, he ſaith, that *Pardon of ſin, and juſtification in law, are not punctually, and preciſely all one. Yet adeth, that the difference is very ſmall, lying chiefly in this, that the* terminus à quo *of Remiſſion is the obligation to puniſhment, but the* terminus *of Juſtification (or the evill) that it formally, and directly frees from, is the Laws accuſation and condemnation. Here* (ſaith he) *though the difference be very narrow, yet a plain difference there is.* How plain? Can the blind man ſee it? Yea as well as he that hath both his eyes; for it is reſpective rather then reall. But how doth the difference lye in the different *termini à quibus*, remiſſion of ſins, and Juſtification free us? becauſe Mr. *Baxter* (a more curious cummin-cutter in Logical diſputes then he that *Ariſtotle* in his Ethicks ſpeaks of, was in dividing of ſecular goods) hath thus cloven the hair into two even rafters, and ſo hath himſelf layd the difference, giving the one rafter for remiſſion of ſins,

and the other to Justification, and bidden each to rest satisfied with his own, and neither to intrench upon the others part. I confess my self to have been so gross witted, untill Mr. *Baxter* doth here teach us so finely to distinguish, that I was apt to have argued in this case somewhat like to Mr. *Baxter*, pag. 208. when it seems his spectacles were off, and his considering cap not on, and so could not see, and conclude punctually where to beat the wedges into the hair to cleave it exactly. As there he cannot close with Mr. *Burgess*, *That Justification, besides the pardon of sin, doth connote a State that the subject is put into*, viz. *a state of favour, being reconciled with God. Because remission it self doth connote the state of favour. For if the losse of Gods favour be a part of the punishment, and all the punishment be remitted, then the favour which was lost, must needs be thereby restored.* So neither should I have easily closed with another, putting Mr. *Baxters* plain difference, pag. 186, between Remission, and Justification, in their said *terminis*, that the one delivers from obligation to punishment, the other from the Laws accusation, and condemnation. Because freedom from obligation to punishment doth connote freedome from the Laws accusation, and condemnation; and freedome from the Laws accusation, and condemnation connotes freedome from obligation to punishment; and so both Remission of sinnes, and Justification, *i. e.* Justification in Romane, and Justification in Secretary hand, have the same *terminus à quo*, viz. The Laws accusation, and condemnation, and obligation to punishment; and consequently that they are one and the same thing. But let Mr. *Baxter* pass in this particle without further interruption. It is not for that he sees a difference, but that he thinkes it will somewhat advantage him in attaining the ends to which he driveth, to make an imaginary difference between pardoning of sinne, and Justification *in terminis*. Therefore doth he so acutely distinguish. And I shall leave him to solace himself in his distinction, without saying any more to it.

2. Neither doe I account it worthy of any deep examination, what in the Explication of the first words of the Definition, that it is [*an Act of God*] hee doth pag. 168. trifle about the difference which he maketh between Christs Acceptance, Pardon, and Kingdome, and Gods Acceptance, Pardon, and Kingdome. We grant unto him, that as of the two Temples that *Marcellus* built at *Rome*, one dedicated to *Virtue*, the other to *Honour*; that

to

to *Honour* had no door to it, but out of the Temple of *Virtue*: So neither is there any other entrance into the Kingdome of Glory, but thorough the Kingdome of Grace. But to put a difference between Christs, and Gods Acceptance, Pardon, and Kingdom, as if the one were upon Earth, the other not untill we are translated hence into Heaven, and so we must be in Heaven first, and bee forgiven afterwards; or as if Christs acceptance, *&c.* were not Gods, or the Fathers Acceptance, Pardon, and Kingdom, is a meerly imaginary dreame of one that listeth to dream waking; pat indeed to Mr. *Baxters* purpose of setting up his two-fold, or rather manifold Justifications; but wholly thwarting and crossing the Scriptures, which affirme, Not that Christ as Mediator reconciled the world to himself, but *that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses to them.* 2. *Cor.* 5.19. And that where Christ forgiveth, there God [not will hereafter forgive, but already] *hath forgiven all our trespasses for Christs sake*, Eph. 4. 32. Col. 2.13. And more often call the Kingdom of Grace here, *the Kingdome of God, then the Kingdome of Christ.* And that the great Absolution at last in the day of Judgement shall be given by Christ, and not by the Father in person, and the same not in Heaven, but before the Ascension of the Saints into Heaven, as is evident by all the Scriptures of the New Testament, which describe the Judgement day. Neither doth the Scripture tell us of any *ultimate perfecting pardon*, beyond, or after this, if ever it so terme this.

3. And of as little moment is that which he hath pag. 169. in the Explication of his Definition of Pardon, calling it [*a gracious Act*] where he blesseth, and kisseth the image [*Tantundem*] set up by *Grotius*, and polished by himselfe, *denying it to bee a pardon, if it be not in some sort gratuitous, or free*, and asserting, that if Christ hath payd for us the *idem, or the proper debt, then there is no place left for pardon, and wee have nothing forgiven us: For the Creditor* (saith he) *cannot refuse the proper debt, nor deny an acquittance upon the receipt thereof*, &c. A meer vanity of words, without either ground, or substance. It doth not alway hold firm in trifling debts of money. Suppose I have a sonne, that having received his portion of my estate from me, will forthwith come and pay it me for the debt of some bankrupt debtor, that I have cast into prison; if indeed it be so agreed upon between my self,

and my ſaid Sonne; and that to this end I gave him ſuch a portion of my eſtate, that he ſhould ſo doe with it, then it were not equity in me to refuſe the payment ſo offered. But yet Maſter *Baxter* wil not deny that this agreement, or covenant between me, and my ſonne, and my receiving of my own monyes in ſatisfaction for that Bankrupts debt, though it be the ſame, to the utmoſt farthing which hee owed, is an act of grace, or favour in mee to the ſaid Debtor. But in caſe there were no ſuch covenant between me, and my ſaid ſonne, but that I gave him the ſaid portion of my goods for other ends, and uſes, and not to pay the Debts of Bankrupts: I ſuppoſe then it is in my choice, either to receive, or refuſe the full debt ſo offered me, becauſe he which offerrs it, was not bound upon the Bond, as Suretie, or as Excecutor, or Adminiſtrator to the Debtor, nor is aſſigned by the Debtor to make payment in his ſtead. What is there in this caſe binding me to receive the debt from ſuch an hand, or to give an acquittance to him that ſhould pay it? Much leſſe will the caſe hold in point of Life and Death. Suppoſe ſome Prieſt, Jeſuit, or other Traytor were by the Law condemned to dye for Treaſon committed: The day of Execution is at hand, Maſter *Baxter* interpoſes, and offereth to dye for him: Is it not in the power of the chiefe Magiſtrates to refuſe the accepting of the death of the Innocent for the Nocent? Or if they doe accept the change, is it not an Act of free grace to pardon the offendor, accepting anothers ſufferings for him? Much more is it a gracious act in God to pardon us upon Chriſts ſuffering in our ſtead, becauſe hee ſent his Sonne, and *gave him a body wherein to ſuffer for us*, Heb. 10. 5. And gives us acquittance, having caſt him into priſon in our behalf, untill he had payd the utmoſt farthing of our debts.

4. What hee ſaith againſt the ignorant Antinomians in the end of page 169, and in page 172, hee hath ſayd before, and it hath been before examined, and his pepper-corne being cruſhed, hath been found too hot in ſmell and operation, for a humble, and ſelfe-denying Chriſtian to meddle with in the point of Juſtification. Therefore I conclude with him, not further to trouble the Reader with thoſe ſenſleſs conceits which have onely a plauſible ſhew of words, but no footing in Scriptures, or authority from Scriptures to eſtabliſh them.

The

The rest of the Doctrine which hee delivereth in this page
o, and addeth page 171, and 172, I doe in part grant him;
d what I grant him not, wee shall finde againe so involved
his dispute, whether Justification bee an immanent, or
nsient Act of God, page 173, *& seq.* that it shall be more pro-
r there then here to take it into examination.

In his 173 page, Master *Baxter* enters upon a dispute of
eat moment, whether Remission and Justification be imma-
nt, or transient Acts of God? Before pag. 93 of this Tractate,
a brave challenge of the Antinomians to produce one Scripture,
fying Justification to be from eternity, hee promised to shew, or
ve that Justification is not an immanent Act in God. Here he ad-
esseth himself to the accomplishment of what he there promi-
d, and in doing it he pretendedly draws the sword against the
tinomians, as the sole assertors of the opinion which he here
th much gallantry seeks to confute.

Two things then I conceive here to call for examina-
on.

First, how sound the reasons are which he brings to deny Par-
n, and Justification to be immanent, and to prove them to bee
erly transient acts of God.

2. What kind of Vermine these Antinomians are, against
om Mr. *Baxter* hath already discharged so many Gun-shots
fore in this Treatise, and findes them nevertheless yet alive, and
a capacity to bear so many more shots from him, in this, and
e following parts of this book.

Before my entrance upon either of these, for an introduction
the former, that the state of the question may the better ap-
ar, I shall endeavour with as much fidelity, and simplicity as
n briefe) I may, to lay downe the judgements of our Prote-
nt Divines, whom he slanders here, and every where (almost)
th Antinomianism, about this question, before mentioned,
ich Mr. *Baxter* here so much opposeth, I mean such of these as
ld (not that all have taught it) to be in some respect immanent
God.

1. Then, in their disputes against *Bellarmine*, *Arminius*, *So-*
nus, and their followers, about remission of sinnes, and
tification they tell us, that justification is taken sometimes
tively, for a judicial act of Gods grace; sometimes passively, or
minatively; as it hath its termination upon believers. In the
for-

former ſenſe, it is an act internal and immanent in God, not tra-
ſient upon an extraneous ſubject; or in plain words, it is ſecret,
biding, and hidden in God himſelfe, not declared or paſſing in
the knowledg and conſcience of man. That it is of the ſame n
ture with the acts of election and reprobation, having its com
plete being, as theſe, before the perſons ſo elected, juſtified a
reprobated, begin to have being, life or faith in them, or to
good or evill. But in its paſſive ſenſe, as it is terminated upo
and made out to the conſcience of a man, ſo it is a tranſient
of God, pronouncing and declaring home to the conſcience
a man now living, convinced of his ſinnes, and trembling at
ſenſe and burthen thereof, yet reſting upon, and cleaving
Chriſt by faith; that his ſinnes are forgiven for Chriſts ſake
by this act and ſentence of God in his conſcience the poor ſin
becomes ſenſible and apprehenſive of his full diſcharge and ab
lution at Gods tribunal, thorow Chriſts ſatisfaction made
juſtice for him.

2. That juſtification, as taken in the former ſenſe, is an Act
Gods ſupreme Lordſhip or dominion, or elſe of his good plea
ſure (to uſe the Apoſtles termes) by which he freely and with
neceſſity, in relation to his juſtice, willeth the ſalvation of
and willeth not the ſalvation of another, loveth or hateth, im
puteth not, or doth impute ſinne, according to his own free wi
But juſtification in the latter ſenſe, is an act of Gods righteouſ
or faithfulneſſe, by which hee faithfully and righteouſly accom
pliſheth his promiſes of grace, in juſtifying and abſolving th
which believe, by the ſentence of pardon pronounced to the
conſcience, according to the Goſpel promiſe made to believe
No word of promiſe went before juſtification in the for
ſenſe, to make it an act of juſtice to fulfill that promiſe; ne
ther could it be an act of his natural juſtice, that by the neceſſ
of his nature he ſhould ſo juſtifie and love any; for then ſho
none be either loved or ſaved freely of God, when contrari
it was in his own free choice, to love or to hate, to ſave or co
demn all, or *mutatis vicibus*, to have loved *Eſau*, & hated *Ja*
to have willed the condemnation of the ſaved, and the ſalvat
of the reprobated. But the word of promiſe preceded juſtifi
tion in the latter ſenſe, which it is righteouſneſſe in God to fu
fill; therefore is it an act as well of his juſtice or righteouſneſ
as of his free grace.

3. Th

That Justification in the former sense is antecedaneous, or fore-
ing to all covenants whatsoever. 1. In order of nature (though
t in time) it goeth before that covenant beeween the father and
e son, mentioned before in the examination of the explication
Mr *Baxters* fourteenth *Thesis*; and consequently before Christs
dertaking to make, or the fathers Covenant to accept what he
ould offer, in satisfaction for the sinnes of the elect. For in or-
r of nature the willing of the end, alway goeth before the wil-
ng of the means conducing to the end; so that Gods willing
ans righteousnesse and immunity from sinne, and loving him
salvation, must needs goe before his willing of Christs satisfy-
g of his justice, which was but a mean appointed of God to
e constituting of man righteous before him, that he might be
re from sinne, discharged from condemnation, and partaker
salvation, which was the end. Not that there was any pre-
dency, or following after, of these acts of God, in time: for
ey are both coeternal, and before all times. Whom God hath
ved, and forgiven their sinnes, them hath he so loved and for-
ven, in and through Christ from all eternity, and through and
r the merit of his satisfaction. Much more doth this imma-
nt act of justification go before, not onely in nature, but in
me also, the other temporary Covenants, both the Covenant of
orkes made with *Adam*, and the Covenant of Grace, made af-
r by Gospel promise, by Christ, or God in Christ, to us and with
. For these had all their being in time. But justification in
s other acceptation is subsequent unto, and followes after, and
an effect of not onely the Covenant of Grace, but of faith it
lfe, which the Covenant of Grace calls for, as a mean to attain
. None else but a beleiver, nor he, until he actually beleeveth,
thus actually justified, or hath pardon of sinnes and absolution
om wrath declared and pronounced of God in his consci-
nce. And thus to be justified in Christ, or in God, is one thing
nd to bee justified in our selves by God through Christ is
nother. The former is an antecedent, the latter an effect or con-
quent of the Covenant of Grace.

That neither the mediation & satisfaction of Christ, nor (much
lfe) our faith in Christ, nor any of the most noble gifts of grace
eceived from Christ, either in their habit or operation do move
God to justifie us, so as to put into him a will to pardon our sins,
nd accept us as righteous, or to change his affection from nilling

to

to will our forgiveneſſe and happineſſe, and from hating to lo
and accept us; becauſe he is God, and therefore immutable; a
there cannot be any cauſe of Gods will rendred, any more th
of God himſelfe. For the Will of God, is God himſelfe, a
theſe immanent acts of God, are God himſelfe acting. So t
the ſubſtration of all that Chriſt hath ſuffered, and by his ſuff
rings ſatisfied for us, and of all that we doe, or can doe to p
our ſelves into union with Chriſt, and a conformity with t
Will of God, are in no wiſe the cauſes or conditions, or antece
dents of Gods firſt loving, owning, and pronouncing us right
ous and pure from ſinne imputed; but the effects thereof. F
he ſo loveth and juſtifieth all, that in a Covenant way have bee
or ſhall be juſtified in their own conſcience, before ever they b
leeve, or live. But that the intervening of Chriſts ſatisfactio
for our ſinnes, and our recumbency upon, and embracing o
Chriſt ſo ſatisfying by faith, that we may be juſtified, do ad no
thing to God which was not, nor alter any thing which was i
his will before; but do onely lay and make a way by Gods ordi
nation, how he from all eternity loving and juſtifying us in hi
ſelfe freely, may in a courſe moſt convenient to magnify bo
his truth and righteouſneſſe, and withal his grace and mercy, a
length actually declare us juſt in, and to our own conſciences, a
for ever acquit us from ſinne and wrath, to the admiration o
Men and Angels. And ſo the former juſtification is a pure, ſim
ple, free, and irreſpective act of God, having no cauſality o
of himſelfe moving him to it: but the latter is a fœderal, Gos
or Covenant juſtification, reſpecting his own Covenant bef
made, Chriſts ſatisfaction already given and pleaded in hea
by Chriſt, and mans faith in the mediator and promiſer, plea
ing the promiſe, and the blood of the mediator ſealing it: upo
all which he doth, he cannot but actually pronounce and decl
to the conſcience of the beleiver his perfect abſolution from
and vengeance. This latter is indeed the juſtifying wherof th
Scriptures primarily ſpeak, as oft as they ſpeak of juſtificati
by faith, but ſo as the former is alſo in ſuch Scriptures implyed
Neither is the Scripture ſilent in reference to the former, as con
ſidered without the latter, or apart from it.

5. That although all that are or ſhall be juſtified by faith i
time, *i.e.* each one in the time when he ſo beleeveth, were juſtifie
alſo in Chriſt, & ſecretly in God before they beleived, or yet live
eve

even from eternity: Yet is there no man justified by vertue of the New Covenant and promise of the Gospel, proclaiming right to the Lord Christ, to forgivenesse of sinnes, freedome from condemnation, heirship to Gods Kingdom, and all other benefits of Christs Passion; until he doth actually beleeve and embrace Christ, thorow him to have all those pretious promises made good and effectual to himselfe. Though in Christ he were Lord of all before, yet differed he nothing in himselfe from a servant, from a child of wrath, his life and righteousnesse were hid with Christ in God; He could claim nothing from God by any evidential title, but wrath and condemnation; though he had right in Christ, yet had he no right unto Christ; though in Christ all was his, because Christ had united, purchased, and received all into his hands for him, yet had he no right to Christ by which to claim a partnership and interest in the kingdome and priviledge of grace, was without all true peace of conscience, all joy and consolation in the promises of grace, under fears and terrors in expectation of wrath and damnation, could be sensible of nothing but anger, hatred and displeasure against him for sinne, knew not himselfe to be one of *the children of promise*, Gal. 4. 28. *to be entitled to Christ, in whom alone the promises of God are yea and Amen*: 2 *Cor.* 1. 20. Therefore as if there had been no Christ, no Mediator and reconciler, no Covenant of Grace, yea no Grace, or acts of Grace eternal or temporary in God thorow Christ, so he remained under a Spirit either of delusion or of bondage still. But now when the father hath drawn him to Christ, and Christ hath received him, when Christ hath apprehended him to himselfe by his Spirit, and he by faith hath apprehended Christ to himselfe for redemption, reconciliation, remission, righteousnesse, and whatsoever else is laid up in Christ for him; and so hath union and communion with Christ, hath Christ in him, and is himselfe in Christ: Now his justification, which was sure before in God and in Christ, is also made sure to his conscience. He is now justified in his own conscience after the manor, and by the vertue of the Gospel and Covenant and promises of Grace; findes and knowes himselfe through Christ absolved at Gods tribunal, hath all the evidences for it that possibly he can desire, the *Word and the Oath of God, that by two immutable things*, in which it is impossible for God to ly, he may have a strong consolation, Heb. 6. 18. *The Word evidenceth, and his faith*

denceth, the Covenant is now ſealed mutually and reciprocally between God and him, *by beleeving he hath put to his ſeal that God is true, and God ſealeth to his conſcience by certifying it by his Spirit, that his wrath is* pacified, that all accuſations are filenced, *there is no condemnation to him being now in Christ Jeſus,* Rom. 8. 1. Himſelfe may now reſt ſatisfied, baniſhing henceforth all fears and doubts, and glorying in the Lord that the ſting of death is paſt, it is enough my ſoul is now alive, *Chriſt is made ſinne for me, that I might become the Righteouſneſſe of God in him,* 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Now Lord letteſt thou thy ſervant depart in peace, for my eyes have ſeen thy Salvation:* and in the interim while he is here enjoying a heaven upon earth, a kingdome of Righteouſneſſe, joy and peace in the Holy Ghoſt, untill he was incorporated by faith into Chriſt, Chriſt might indeed plead for him, but he had no evidence, no ſhew of title, not an article, under God's hand, or from his lips, to plead at Gods barre for life or pardon.

6. That nevertheleſſe when a man truly beleeveth, then may he apprehend juſtification and remiſſion of ſinnes not onely as now firſt declared and evidenced to his own ſoul: But alſo as paſt and compleat before the foundation of the world was laid. Becauſe from eternity Chriſt ſatisfied, in that he undertook to ſatisfie, for the ſinnes of the Elect; and God from eternity reſted in this ſatisfaction undertaken by Chriſt, and ſo laid aſide all diſpleaſure which (without this Covenant between him and his only Son) he might have taken up as wel againſt them that ſhould afterward beleeve, as againſt them which dye in unbeleef. For their juſtification in time doth *à poſteriore* argue their juſtification before all times: and where faith findes the leaſt rivulet of the great ſtream ſent forth, it can, it ought, by it to aſcend up to the very fountain to be filled and ſatisfied with the deliciouſneſſe thereof. Thus ſhall we finde the Apoſtle almoſt in all his Epiſtles, from the ſenſe of their preſent enjoyments in Chriſt, to carry upward the Saints to whom he writeth, unto the very boſom of Gods eternal grace, counſell and good pleaſure where all was laid up and treaſured for them from all eternity, that thence it might in due time be ſhed forth upon them. Faith runs not away raſhly and haſtily with the gift, but delights to enter and pierce through the vail, to contemplate and embrace the as well eternal, as infinite love of the giver.

7. That

7. That although no man receiveth the sensible comfort of his justification before he actually beleeveth, yet every elect vessell hath (besides, and without his knowledge) the true benefit thereof (as to freedome from vengeance) throughout the whole time of his infidelity: was in Christ beloved, accepted and owned of God as righteous, in that his sinne was not imputed, as fully before as after he beleeved, the price of his redemption was paid, all his sinnes borne and punished upon the shoulders, yea the soul and body of Christ, so that himselfe was no lesse exempted from the revenging wrath of God, & from all obligation to make any part of satisfaction in his own person for his sinnes, as hee that was already in Christ by faith: So that whatsoever afflictions befell him in the time of his unbelief, were not the infliction of the curse, as the curse for sinne, but sanctified chastisements of a loving father, flowing from his grace and favour, not from his indignation and hatred against his person (though against his sins) tending all to his good, not to his ruine. Else if he should have born the least stroke of Gods revenging justice, and in the least pittance have made but one least peece of satisfaction by his sufferings for his offences, then either Christ hath made satisfaction for him but in part; and is not his whole Saviour and redeemer, for that himselfe hath satisfied divine justice in part: or otherwise the father hath taken satisfaction twice for the same sins, once from the Lord Christ, and after that from the offender also. But this were to slander either the perfection of Christs mediation, or the incorruptnesse of Gods justice, both which are unsufferable.

8. That the justification which is by faith consisteth not onely in a bare apprehension of our justification and pardon from God, (for this is onely mans act, and no expresse act of God) but first in Gods actual declaration, evidencing and certifying the conscience of man drawn to the barre of judgement (set up as it were in the conscience) that God hath taken satisfaction to his offended justice from the Lord Christ for all the offenders sinnes, and hath for ever quit-claimed and discharged him from all sin and wrath, and admitted him into favour and family to be under the dispensations of his grace for ever. And then indeed God having by this act absolved the conscience, there followeth also the sense of our remission and justification: So that besides this sense and apprehension, there are two things in our justifi-

cation by faith over and above that which was in our eternal justification in Christ: *viz.* 1. A total diffidence and denyal of our own righteousnesse, and a trusting and adhering wholly and onely to Christ for pardon and justification. 2. Gods act upon our consciences, declaring and assuring us that our debt is paid by Christ, and we discharged upon the satisfaction which our surety hath made, so that the obligation is cancelled, and we depart with a full and general acquittance in our consciences. Neither of these were there in the former justification, *i. e.* in the justification in the former sense before mentioned, and so that there is more than the bare knowledge of our justification, in our being justified in the latter sense is evident.

Whatsoever else is conteined in the doctrine of the Protestant divines about this question, we shall have occasion to adde in examining what Master *Baxter* saith here, and afterwards to oppugn it.

But the chief thing is yet behind, (may some say) *viz.* the proof of these positions by sound Arguments, or by evidencing Scriptures: and the main thing to be proved, is, that there is such a justification as is an immanent and eternal act in God. It is Master *Baxters* lowd challenge. pag. 93. *Let all the* Antinomians *shew but one Scripture that speaketh of justification from eternity.* I will be so charitable as to conceive, he expects not that we should produce Scriptures that say in those very words, but (that which is the *Tantundem*) that say it in sense and substance; else if he reject the matter, and stick to words, I shall challenge him to produce one sentence of all the sermons which Christ preached, and in the whole doctrine that he personally delivered, which speaketh at all of justification by faith. But in words equipollent to Master *Baxters*, the Scripture delivereth this doctrine which he oppoſeth, *viz.* justification from eternity.

First, What lesse is to be gathered from 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. *God hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ, before the World began.* What can be said more fully to Master *Baxters* challenge? He will not deny that the word saving, doth include in it justifying, for so should he both contradict himselfe, and lose elsewhere more than he can gain here, by denying it. It will then run thus, that we are justified and called of God with a holy calling, not according to our works, [these words

destroy

roy the end of Maſter *Baxters* oppoſing the eternity of our ju-
cation] if our own qualifycation and workes may not come
ollaterally with Chriſt to conſtitute us juſtified, he little re-
ds whether the act be immanent or tranſient) but according
is purpoſe and grace, which was given us in Chriſt, before
world began, and that is from eternity. See, the grace of
ification and ſalvation was given us in Chriſt from eter-
.

Obiect Maſter *Baxter* may probably object, that the grace was
ced given us in Chriſt from eternity, that is, God had decreed
m eternity to juſtifie us in Chriſt, when we ſhould come to be-
e in him, to juſtifie or ſave us in time, as to call us in time.
r the grace here mentioned given us in Chriſt before times, is
much affirmed to be the grace of our vocation or calling, as of
r ſaving and juſtifying. But our calling muſt, therefore our
ification alſo muſt be in time. And thus by the grace given,
ſt be underſtood Gods gracious purpoſe, and decree to give us
ation and juſtification. So Mr. *Baxter*, *I know God hath de-
d to juſtifie his people from eternity. But it is done in time*,
ge 93.

Sol. 1. That Covenant juſtifying, or the declaring of us in
r own Conſciences to bee accepted as juſt in Chriſt, is not
yet to be an act accompliſhed in us in time. Nor yet that
d decreed from Eternity to declare us in our conſciences
ghteous, when wee ſhould beleeve. But the granting of all
s nothing advantageth Maſter *Baxters* cauſe: For neither
h this Act of God in time terminate upon our conſcience, nor
eternal decree ſo to juſtifie us (beleeving) in our ſelves, de-
that wee were juſtified in God, and in Chriſt from Eter-
y.

2. It appears not that the Apoſtle here ſpeaketh of our calling
he participation of Chriſt, and of juſtification and ſanctifi-
on by him in time, but rather of that calling mentioned *Rom.*
7. *That God calleth thoſe things that be not, as though they were.*
he called *Abraham the father of many Nations*, when he was yet
er childleſſe, or at leaſt was in reference to the ſtrength of na-
, without having, without hope to have that child from
om thoſe nations ſhould iſſue and accrew to him as their fa-
r. So God is ſaid to have called us with a holy calling, *i. e.*
ave called and reputed us in Chriſt his pardoned, accepted

cation by faith over and above that which was in our eternal justification in Christ: *viz.* 1. A total diffidence and denyal of our own righteousnesse, and a trusting and adhering wholly and onely to Christ for pardon and justification. 2. Gods act upon our consciences, declaring and assuring us that our debt is paid by Christ, and we discharged upon the satisfaction which our surety hath made, so that the obligation is cancelled, and we depart with a full and general acquittance in our consciences. Neither of these were there in the former justification, *i. e.* in the justification in the former sense before mentioned, and so that there is more than the bare knowledge of our justification, in our being justified in the latter sense is evident.

Whatsoever else is conteined in the doctrine of the Protestant divines about this question, we shall have occasion to adde in examining what Master *Baxter* saith here, and afterwards to oppugn it.

But the chief thing is yet behind, (may some say) *viz.* the proof of these positions by sound Arguments, or by evidencing Scriptures: and the main thing to be proved, is, that there is such a justification as is an immanent and eternal act in God. It is Master *Baxters* lowd challenge. pag. 93. *Let all the* Antinomians *shew but one Scripture that speaketh of justification from eternity.* I will be so charitable as to conceive, he expects not that we should produce Scriptures that say in those very words, but (that which is the *Tantundem*) that say it in sense and substance; else if he reject the matter, and stick to words, I shall challenge him to produce one sentence of all the sermons which Christ preached, and in the whole doctrine that he personally delivered, which speaketh at all of justification by faith. But in words equipollent to Master *Baxters*, the Scripture delivereth this doctrine which he opposeth, *viz.* justification from eternity.

First, What lesse is to be gathered from 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. *God hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ, before the World began.* What can be said more fully to Master *Baxters* challenge? He will not deny that the word saving, doth include in it justifying, for so should he both contradict himselfe, and lose elswhere more than he can gain here, by denying it. It will then run thus, that we are justified and called of God with a holy calling, not according to our works, [these words

destroy

destroy the end of Master *Baxters* opposing the eternity of our justification] if our own qualifycation and workes may not come in collaterally with Christ to constitute us justified, he little regards whether the act be immanent or transient) but according to his purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ, before the world began, and that is from eternity. See, the grace of justification and salvation was given us in Christ from eternity.

Object Master *Baxter* may probably object, that the grace was indeed given us in Christ from eternity, that is, God had decreed from eternity to justifie us in Christ, when we should come to beleeve in him, to justifie or save us in time, as to call us in time. For the grace here mentioned given us in Christ before times, is as much affirmed to be the grace of our vocation or calling, as of our saving and justifying. But our calling must, therefore our justification also must be in time. And thus by the grace given, must be understood Gods gracious purpose, and decree to give us salvation and justification. So Mr. *Baxter*, *I know God hath decreed to justifie his people from eternity. But it is done in time*, page 93.

Sol. 1. That Covenant justifying, or the declaring of us in our own Consciences to bee accepted as just in Christ, is not denyed to be an act accomplished in us in time. Nor yet that God decreed from Eternity to declare us in our consciences Righteous, when wee should beleeve. But the granting of all this nothing advantageth Master *Baxters* cause: For neither doth this Act of God in time terminate upon our conscience, nor his eternal decree so to justifie us (beleeving) in our selves, deny that wee were justified in God, and in Christ from Eternity.

2. It appears not that the Apostle here speaketh of our calling to the participation of Christ, and of justification and sanctification by him in time, but rather of that calling mentioned *Rom.* 4. 17. *That God calleth those things that be not, as though they were.* As he called *Abraham the father of many Nations*, when he was yet either childlesse, or at least was in reference to the strength of nature, without having, without hope to have that child from whom those nations should issue and accrew to him as their father. So God is said to have called us with a holy calling, *i. e.* to have called and reputed us in Christ his pardoned, accepted

and adopted children, even before we had any actual being in our ſelves. *Dedit qui erat, accepit qui non erat. Quis autem hoc facere potuit, niſi qui vocat ea quæ non ſunt tanquam ea quæ ſunt. Aug. in verb. Apoſt. Sect.*

3. If by Calling it be pertinaciouſly maintained that we muſt underſtand that which is done by the Miniſtry of the Goſpel; yet all this helps not Maſter *Baxter* at all, in regard of the excluſive clauſe following, not according to our workes, where our ſalvation and juſtification as well as our vocation, are denyed to have any dependance upon our own workes and qualifications, as conditions thereof: And the whole end of Maſter *Baxters* diſpute againſt juſtification as an immanent Act in God, is, becauſe if that be granted, there will be no place for footing our works and qualifications as neceſſarily precedent conditions of juſtification. And theſe fall to ground, as well as if we were juſtified without them, though in time, as if wee were juſtified from Eternity.

4. But how, and whether we can truly, and properly be ſaid to have received Grace in Chriſt before all worlds, whereby we are ſaved, and juſtified, and yet not to be ſaved, and juſtified in Chriſt before the world was, will come to bee examined in drawing forth the ſenſe of other Scriptures which I ſhall annex. In the interim this remaines unqueſtioned, that although the Apoſtle ſpeak here of Juſtification in our ſelves in time, yet he affirmes it to be according to the Grace given us in Chriſt before the world; ſo it was in Chriſt for us before, though not in our ſelves till we believe.

Againe when the Scripture ſpeaking of the Sonnes of *Iſaac*, ſaith of them, while yet unborn, and conſequently having neither done good nor evill, *Jacob have I loved, but Eſau have I hated. Mal.* 1.2,3. *Rom* 9.11,13. And elſwhere pronounceth of man that when *they lay in their blood, in their nakedneſs then hee ſaid it the time of love, ſayd to them live, ſpread his skirt over them, and covered them, entred into Covenant with them, and made them his*, Ezek. 16. 6, 8. *God of his great love wherewith hee hath loved us even when we were dead in ſins and treſpaſſes hath quickned us, &c.* Epheſ 2. 4, 5. *God commendeth his love to us that when we were yet ſinners, when enemies, we were juſtified by Chriſts blood, and reconciled to God by his death.* Rom. 5 8, 9, 10. Here it is evident to all men that the love of God juſtifying and re-

con-

Conciling us to himſelf, goeth before our Faith and Workes, was then in its power and operation, when wee were yet ſinners, in all our pollution, enemies, dead in ſinne, therefore without any ſpirituall motion, or operation to our own cleanſing, or happineſs. I demand now when this love of God ſo juſtifying us beganne? Not when we beleeved, and firſt obeyed the Goſpel, for it went before, it was then acted toward us when wee were enemies, dead, &c. Or when wee beganne to be ſinners? Then it ſeems our ſinne begat this love in God, and then let the Atheiſts Aphoriſm ſtand as an impregnable Principle, let our ſinne abound, that the grace and love of God may abound. Or was there ever an hatred of us, as a contrary affection in God, before, which is now expelled that love might ſucceed in its place? And hath God now changed his hating of us to condemne us, into a love to juſtifie and ſave us? This were to accuſe God of mutableneſs and change. For God is Love, 1 *Iohn* 4. 8. and the Love of God is God himſelfe loving, and to affirme where wee finde the Love of God at preſent, that there was a time when this Love was not in God, and a time when God beganne to love, is no other but to affirme, that there was a time when God yet was not, and a time when he beganne to bee God, the will of God being God himſelfe; And the volitions, or willings of God, being God himſelf willing: And the acts of Gods Love and Hatred being acts of Gods Will; yea of God himſelfe, and no more ſubject to change (becauſe immanent in God) then God himſelfe. So that theſe Scriptures which affirme Gods love to us when ſinners, doe affirm alſo conſequentially his love to us before we were either in being, or juſt, or ſinners, even from eternity.

Thirdly, when the Lord ſaith to his people, *I have loved thee with an everlaſting love*, Jerem. 13. 3. Doth hee not mean a love which is from everlaſting to everlaſting? Or is there a Love of God to everlaſting which was not from everlaſting? Or was it not the Love of accepting, and approbation of them unto Righteouſneſſe and Salvation, whereof hee there ſpeaketh? And when the Apoſtle *Iohn* tels us, that the glory of Gods love doth herein ſhine forth, *Not that we loved him, but that he loved us*, 1 *Iohn* 4. 10. making not our love, or any fruits thereof, the foundation of Gods love to us, but the love of God to us to goe before

before and prevent our love; is not this a doctrin universally true of all the Saints that are or have been, that Gods love to them prevented, and was antecedaneous to their love toward him? if so, then consequently before mans being, as well as before his loving, and if before mans being, then from eternity *was this grace given us, that we were loved of God in Christ, to justification and salvation.* It is that which the Lord Christ speaketh, (and that not obscurely) in his prayer before his passion, where having interceded and craved sundry blessings for his Elect, he adds this reason why he craved those blessings in their behalfe, viz. *That the world may know that thou hast sent me, and that thou hast loved them as thou hast loved me. Jo.* 17. 23. How is that? in the next verse he explaineth himself thus. *Thou hast loved me before the foundation of the world:* what doth follow hence, but that as Christ, so they that are Christs, were loved of God unto life, before the foundation of the world? why will not Master *Baxter* acknowledge what Christ hath prayed that all the world may know?

Object. 1. Or will it be objected, that God loving the Elect in Christ before the foundation of the world, is to be understood only in this sense, that before the foundation of the world, God decreed in himselfe to love them in Christ afterward in time? Then must we so conclude of Christ also, that God loved Christ before, that is, decreed before the foundation of the world to love Christ in after time, not that he loved him from eternity, for as hee loved Christ, so he loved them in Christ: But he actually loved Christ as the head of the Church before the foundation of the World, therefore also he loved the Elect in Christ as the body and members of Christ before the foundation of the world. Yea to decree from eternity, to love them afterward in time, and untill the time came, to hate them, or not to love them in Christ, was to decree mutablenesse and change in his own will, *i. e.* in himselfe, which is wholly repugnant to his nature that cannot change, by receiving augmentation unto, or diminution of the acts of his Will, which were in him from eternity.

Object. 2. But perhaps Master *Baxter* may object with his friends of the Netherlands, the *Arminians*, whose ghosts have much infested us within this Nation these many years, that this love of God from Eternity, that which he shed abroad upon the Elect when they were yet sinners, enemies, and dead in sin, is to be understood onely of

of Gods universal & common love, his love to all the creatures which he hath made, or at the uttermost his φιλανθρωπία, his love unto mankind which he extends to all alike; Making the raine to descend, and his Sun to shine upon the just and unjust, and fills the hearts of all with food and gladness.

Sol. But how then was *Jaakob* loved and *Esau* hated, when *Esau* partaked more of this common love than *Jaakob*? or was it a Common love by which God doth justifie and reconcile sinners to himselfe? then all shall be reconciled, justified and saved. Or when the Apostle termes it πολλὴ ἀγάπη the much, or great love of God, out of which when he quickned us, yet dead in sinnes and trespasses, *Eph.* 2. 4. was this the common love extended to all the Sonns and Daughters of *Adam* without difference? Then also (for God loved us as he loved Christ) the love of God to Christ was a common love, in nothing supereminent to the love wherewith he loved *Cain* and *Judas*.

Lastly, when God saith, *I have not beheld iniquity in* Jaakob, *nor seen perverseness in Israel*, Num. 23.21. it will (I doubt not) be granted that the meaning was, that God did not see it to impute it, as to the curse which *Baalam* was hired to denounce from God against *Israel*. If God did not actually see iniquity and perverseness in *Israel*, then never did he see it in any people; so degenerate had *Israel* been into the idolatries of the Egyptians, so full of infidelity and murmuring in the Wilderneſse, untill the very day that God thus spake; that unless wee will make him *Plinies* God, that doth not descend in his providence lower than the starrie and Celestial Spheres, to intermixe himself with earthly things, for fear of attracting to himself pollution thence; Wee must acknowledge that he saw iniquity in that people. But he saw it not to impute it, although he saw it clearly to reprove it, and to purge it out of them. Also in those Scriptures, where God *imputeth to men righteousness without works, pronouncing them blessed, whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered, and to whom God imputeth no sin, but imputeth righteousness*, Rom. 4. 6, 7, 8. 11. 2 Cor. 5. 19. To what time shall we reduce this imputation to find it in its Originall, if not to Eternity? When began God to account or reckon us righteous in Christ, or not to impute sinne to us, if he did not actually

doe it in himselfe before time from eternity? When else was the generation of the Elect reckoned righteous in Christ first, and had their iniquity no more imputed; but when Christs satisfaction became effectuall for them? But this Master *Baxter* before, page 23, 24. acknowledgeth, and maintaineth to be when Christ undertooke to satisfie in their behalf. How should it be otherwise? when Christ came to bee voluntarily bound for them, then were they dismissed free. *When he became sinne for them, they became the righteousnesse of God in Christ.* 2 Cor. 5. 21. At once their sinnes were imputed to Christ in point of satisfaction to bee made for them; and they discharged for ever, (*viz.* in the Court where these things were transacted between the Father and the Sonne) from making satisfaction in their own persons, and reckoned perfectly righteous for ever, in respect of vengeance, and condemnation for sinne. But Christs undertaking to satisfie for them, and consequently the whole transaction, and covenant between the Father and him about our Redemption, and Justification, and the said imputation of the sins of the Elect to Christ, were all from eternity, before the foundation of the world, else how could they bee loved in Christ before the foundation of the world? Therefore also their being accounted Righteous in Christ, the not imputation of sinne unto them, their absolution, and discharge from condemnation (and this Master *Baxter* will acknowledge to be Justification) were perfited in God, and in Christ before the foundation of the World. Yea however some godly Commentators speak beneath the mind of the Apostle, yet his words are plaine, and full, *Tit.* 1. 2. 1 *Tim.* 1. 9. *That God hath promised eternall life, and given us Grace in Christ before the world began.* How promised? unto Christ our head, and to us in him, by that eternall Covenant between the Father and the Son? And how given us in him, but as *John* saith, *He hath given us eternall life, and this life is in his Son*; *viz.* laid up in him for us from eternity, to be received in time into our selves, as we receive Christ, according to what followeth, *He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life*, 1 *Joh.* 5. 11, 12. And the grace or life that in that 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. is said to be given us in Christ before times, is ver. 10. affirmed to be brought to light by Christ

Christ in these last times; As the former seems the Immanent, so this the Transient Act of Justification. Else let Mr. *Baxter* produce any other season of such a parley and covenant between God and Christ since the world beganne. He finds this project not to thrive in the hands of his friends the Arminians, therefore as ashamed of it, he layes it aside, not touching it (as far as I can remember) in any part of this his Tractate.

As for that giddy and unbottomed devise of *Grotius*, which Master *Baxter* laies down first in his own words, Thes. 15 pag. 92. and then in *Grotius* his words, pag. 94, 95. it hathin its due place received so much in answer, as I think fit to be given to so bold & peremptory an assertion as hath nothing but a dream for its father, and neither Scripture nor shew of reason annexed to confirm it.

If it be objected, that the Apostle in the afore quoted Chapter affirms faith to be imputed for righteousnesse, and that it was so reckoned to *Abraham* when he was yet in uncircumcision: and thence concluded that therefore we are justified in time even when wee beleeve, wee grant the argument in respect of fœderall justification, or Gods transient act, concerning declaring a man justified to his own conscience.

This alone the Apostle there asserteth, and this is acknowledged by our Divines (as hath been said before) not to be untill we actually beleeve. But this is nothing to the confuting, no nor to the weakening of our Justification, compleated in God, and in Christ before the foundation of the world. This I take to be the sum of the Doctrine which Mr. *Baxter* aspersеth with Antinomianism; which I beleeve no other Papist, or Arminian had done before him. As well, and properly might hee have termed it Mahometanism; for as agreeable is it with the principles of this, as of that. How consenting it is with the Scripture I leave to the unprejudiced Reader to judge. The very flower of all our Protestant Writers have asserted it in such numbers, as would fill up a page to name them. Neither know I any one Writer which (having not occasion to manifest himselfe to be of the same judgement) hath ever expressed himselfe to dissent from it: Till Doctor *Downham* excepted against Master *Pemble* for de-

livering it, and that upon a ſtrange ground, that declared great inadvertency in the reading of the Doct. *viz. That he believeth no man had ſo written before Mr. Pemble.* Within theſe ten years indeed, ſome others of great place and name (amongſt our ſelves) have diſrelliſhed it. But (as farre as I can by enquiry find) have not communicated their reaſons to their Brethren, why they did it, therefore ought not to be angry with them, if by an implicite Faith they take not in the ſame diſrelliſh alſo. For my own part I muſt crave the liberty to ſee light for my guidance into the contrary aſſertion, before I lay down this as darkneſs, unto which I at leaſt think my ſelf to have been led by the light of the Word. Yet with theſe Proviſo's (to prevent miſtakes) I adhere to his opinion.

1. That this Immanent Act in God doth not deny his Tranſient Act of Juſtifying man when he beleeveth, any more then this latter doth that former.

2. That the Tranſient Act of Juſtification conſiſteth not onely in Gods evidencing and manifeſting to the beleever that he was really juſtified in God from eternity; but alſo in Gods Actual, and Judiciall pronouncing of the ſentence of Abſolution to the ſoul drawn to Gods Tribunal, and gaſping for pardon thorough Chriſt. By means whereof the poor ſinner is conſtituted, as well as declared actually, and perſonally righteous, and that before God his Juſtifier.

3. That as oft as the Goſpel ſpeaketh of Juſtification by Faith, it is in reference to this Tranſient Act of God, not that Immanent.

4. That as I conceive the Covenant between God and Chriſt to be (if I may ſo term it) a fruit, in order to that immanent act in God; ſo I think alſo that the Covenant of Promiſe, the Covenant under the Law, the Covenant under the Goſpel, and the very Covenant of Works to be ſubſervients to this Covenant made with Chriſt as a publick perſon, repreſenting us, to work all coordinately to the advancing of the glory of Gods Grace to his Elect, in juſtifying them in himſelf from Eternity. Yet ſo, that if I find a candid Teacher in any, or all theſe to inform me better, I hope I ſhall not be wanting to ſhew my docility.

I ſhould have wholly forborn to touch upon this point (ſo famous

famous a Divine having lately taken upon him the Province) but this was written before, and it will not hinder his further prosecution thereof, to which I hear hee will bee provoked.

As to Mr. *Baxter*, let him pretend what he will of his zeal against this Doctrine, because it is *a Pillar of Antinomianism*, yet his conscience tels him that his rage against it is under this consideration, *as it is a sledge to beat in peeces* the conditional Justification, Election, Redemption, and Grace; together with the pride of mans Free-will, Works, and Righteousnesse, uncertainty of Perseverance, &c. Which are the Articles of Faith common to Mr. *Baxter* with the Papists and Arminians. If Justification, as an immanent act in God from Eternity, hold, all these must fall, and Master *Baxter* and his fellows bee crushed with the ruines thereof. The worke of the next Chapter therefore shall bee, to examine the force of his reasons, and arts, whereby he seekes to refute, and subvert it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

Arg. *Mr.* Baxters *Reasons and Dispute examined, by which he endeavoureth to refute Justification as an Immanent Act in God, and from Eternity.*

B. *A great question it is, whether Remission and Justification be Immanent, or Transient Acts of God: The mistake of this one point was that that led those two most excellent, famous Divines, Doctor* Twiss *and Mr.* Pemble *to that errour, and pillar of Antinomianism, viz. Justification from Eternity. For such Doctor* Twiss *often (All acts immanent in God are from Eternity: But Justification and Remission of sin are Immanent acts. Therefore, &c.*

By [Immanent in God] they must needs mean Negatively, not Positively: For Acts have not the respect of an Adjunct to its Subject, but of an Effect to its Cause.

Now whether all such Immanent Acts are any more Eternall then Transient Acts, is much questioned: As for God to know that the world doth now exist, that such a man is now just, or sanctified, &c. Gods fore-knowledge is not a knowing that such a thing is which is not, but that such a thing will be which is not. Yet doth this make no change in God, no more then the Sun is changed by the variety of creatures which it doth enlighten and warm, or the glass by the variety of faces which it represents, or the eye by the variety of colours which it beholdeth. (For whatsoever some say, I doe not think that every variation of the object maketh a reall change in the eye, or that the beholding of ten distinct colours at one view, doth make ten distinct acts of the sight, or alterations of it; much less doe the objects of Gods knowledge make such alterations.) But grant that all Gods Immanent Acts are Eternall (which I think is quite beyond

beyond our understanding to know) yet most Divines will deny the minor, and tell you that Remission, and Justification are Transient Acts; which is true, but a truth which I never had the happiness to see well cleared by any. For to prove it a Transient Act, they tell us no more, but that it doth transire in subjectum extraneum, by making a Morall change on our relation, though not a reall upon our persons, as Sanctification doth. But this is onely to affirme, and not to prove, and that in generall onely, not telling us what Act it is that maketh this change. Relations are not capable of being the patients, or subjects of any Act, seeing they be but meer Entia Rationis, and no reall beings. Neither are they the immediate product, or effect of any Act, but in order of Nature are consequentiall to the direct effects. The proper effect of the Act, is to lay the foundation from whence the Relation doth arise. And the same Act which layeth the foundation doth cause the Relation, without the intervention of any other. Suppose but the subjectum, fundamentū & terminus; and the Relation will unavoydably follow by a meer resultancy. The direct effect therefore of Gods actuall Justification must be a reall effect, though not upon the sinner, yet upon something else for him. And thence will his passive Justification follow. Now what Transient Act this is, And what its immediate real effect, who hath unfolded, I dare not be too confident in so dark a point. But it seemeth to me, that this justifying transient Act is the enacting, or promulgation of the New Covenant, wherein Justification is conferred upon every beleever. Here passing, and enacting this grant, is a transient Act.

2. So may the continuance of it (as I think.)

3. This Law, or grant, hath a Meral improper action, whereby it may be said to pardon, or justifie, which properly is but virtuall justifying.

4. By this grant God doth,

1. Give us the righteousnesse of Christ to be ours when we beleeve.

2. And

2. *And disableth the Law to oblige us to punishment, or to condemn us.*

3. *Which reall foundation being thus laid, our relations of* [*Iustified and pardoned in title of Law*] *do necessarily result.*

A matchlesse and egregious dispute, able to turn all the immanent Acts of God into Transient, yea, it spell'd backward, to turne all his Transient Acts into immanent; of force enough to extort from Gods bosome all that was in him from eternity, that it shall abide in him, or with him no longer.

Here is Doctrine fitted to purpose for his ignorant babes, and tender lambs of *Kederminster*, for whose sake and use, this worke (if wee will believe the Author) was chiefly published: No lesse proper for them, than the Scripture in the Latine tongue by his holy mother appointed, for the illumination of them that cannot read her English, or their Country language. What a supereminent measure of the Spirit hath this man received above Christ himselfe, above *Paul*, the most learned of all Christs Apostles? *Christ was annointed with the Spirit to preach the Gospel to the poor.* Luke 4. 18. Isa. 61. 1. *And had received from the Lord God the tongue of the learned, to speak a word in season to the weary.* Isa. 50. 4. This mans Spirit carries him aloft in the Aire, to clowd the Gospel from the poor, and to darken with his vaporous Sophistry the things which *God hath hidden from the wise and prudent, but revealed to babes*: and useth the tongue of the learned to amaze and intangle, not to refresh the weary. *Paul* descended *from all excellency of speech and of wisdom*, to the capacity, or rather incapacity of the weak Christians in the Ministry of the Gospel, 1 *Cor.* 2. 1, 2. *and fed the babes with milk.* 1 Cor. 3. 1, 2. *And even, then when he spake wisedom to the perfect, because perfect; it was not the wisedome of the World, or of the Princes* [for learning] *of the World, but the Mysterious and hidden wisedom of God; and this he spake also not in the words which mans wisedome teacheth* [which the subtile Sophisters made use of] *but which the Holy Gost teacheth, comparing spirituall things with spirituall.* 1. Cor 2. 6, 7. 13. This man, casting away the words which the Holy Gnost teacheth, and useth in the holy Scriptures, sends his poore lambes to feed, and seek spiritu-

ſpiritual paſture in th thorny Copſes of his Maſter *Ariſtotle*, and his Saint *Suarez*, Saint *Vaſques*, Saint *Fonſeca's* Metaphyſicks, and Metaphyſical Jeſuitical Divinity, or in Seraphical *Scotus* his Quodlibetary learning; all which underſtood juſt ſo much of the Spirit and myſtery of the Goſpel, in this greateſt point of Goſpel Doctrine [Juſtification] as the unlearned people of *Kederminſter* do of this and the like peeces of this tractate of Mr. *Baxter*.

As for the matter it ſelf, he that underſtands it not, ſhall be as much endoctrined by it, as he that underſtands it. For my own part, I profeſſe I ſee nothing in it of any more force to refute the opinion which he here oppoſeth [Eternal Juſtification, or Juſtification as an immanent Act in God] than there is in a Peacocks Feather to daſh out all the teeth of a Lion. For ſhould wee grant to him all that he here ſaith (the thing in queſtion onely excepted) That *immanent in God muſt be underſtood, not Poſitively but Negatively, for that Acts have not the reſpect of an Adjunct to its ſubject, but of an effect to its Cauſe; that Gods juſtifying a man when he believeth, argues no change in God, any more than is found in the Sunne, glaſſe, or eye, by the variety of creatures faces, colours, ſet before them; as he mentioneth: what of all this?* What will he conclude at length againſt that which he ſaith Doctor *Twiſſe* maketh the Major of his Argument, [*vizt.* That all immanent Acts in God are from Eternity.] will he deny it? Nay, but diſtruſting the weakneſſe of his reaſoning, he doth rather grant it. *But grant* (ſaith he) *that all Gods immanent Acts are eternal, (which yet I think is quite beyond our underſtanding to know)* This is the reſult of all his Argumentation, as to the Major; It is true, notwithſtanding any thing I have ſaid, or can ſay againſt it, onely I think it is beyond our underſtanding to judge whither it be univerſally true or no.

As to the Minor of Doctor *Twiſſe* his Argument, (*vizt. That Remiſſion and Juſtification are Immanent Acts*) he diſputes with as little dexterity as to the Major. *Moſt Divines* (ſaith he) *will deny the Minor, and tell you that they are but tranſient Acts.* Be it ſo. But what have thoſe moſt Divines to ſay for the diſapproving of the Minor? 'Tis true (ſaith Mr. *Baxter*) what they ſay, but *I could never have the happineſſe to ſee, or hear it well cleared*

by any. For to prove it tranſient they tell us no more, but that it doth tranſire in Subjectum Extraneum, *By making a moral change on our Relation,* &c. *But this* (ſaith he) *is to affirm and not to prove.* What then doth Mr *Baxter* himſelf to ſupply what is in his moſt famous Divines deficient? This onely: he tels us a tale of a Tubb, about relations how they are made up, and thence he brings in his Conjectures to make clear how this change of our relation is made up, that our Factional Juſtification, or Juſtification according to the New Covenant is a Tranſient Act of God; which I was never ſo happy, or unhappy in my ſlender reading, to find any one that denyeth. And all this being granted, yet may it ſtand as a firm foundation, that Remiſſion and Juſtification are immanent Acts in God, as hath been before, and ſhall be, (if there be need) more fully afterward ſhewed.

He that readeth Mr. *Baxters* diſpute, muſt acknowledge that I do him no wrong in this Epitomizing of it. And let every rationall man judge whether the heat of the man in promiſing ſo confidently before *pag.* 93. and in charging all his *impetus*, or impotent impetuouſneſs here, as againſt the *Pillars of Antinomianiſm*, be anſwered with ſtrength of reaſon to beat down what he would have down, *Gods Eternal acceptation and approbation of his beloved ones in Chriſt Jeſus.* Thus feeble are the moſt Nervous armes in fighting againſt God, and ſo vain in their imaginations (as the Apoſtle ſaith) do they become, who whet their wits upon the threſhold of humane literature to diſpute againſt God.

But after this generall view of his diſpute, it ſhall not be impertinent to take notice of the particulars alſo therein encloſed.

And 1. Why doth he call Doctor *Twiſſe* and Maſter *Pemble*, *Moſt excellent famous Divines*? Doth he ſo ſtile them for the excellency of their Philoſophick Scholaſtick learning? He ſhould then more properly have termed them *Moſt excellent famous Philoſophers*, *or Schollars*: Except he will alſo make *Ariſtotle* (becauſe he in his τῶν μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ makes the Treating of God, one part of that Doctrine which is to be handled in that Science which is commonly called Metaphyſicks) to be a Theologer or Divine alſo. Or for their abundant knowledge in the Doctrine

Doctrine of Chriſtian Religion, together with their great ability and faithfullneſſe to teach and maintain it againſt the Adverſaries thereof? Much more proper had it been then, for him to have followed the Genius and policy of the chief Prieſts (as in other things he doth) that would not ſay any thing to the Praiſe of *Iohn*, that his *Baptiſm or Doctrine were Divine and from Heaven, fearing*, leſt the Lord Jeſus ſhould then urge upon them: *Why then did yee not believe him?* Mat. 21. 25. For ſo Maſter *Baxter* here opens his boſome to the dint of the like reproof. Were they excellent? Why doth not he cloſe with them in their excellency. No one of the Papiſts or Arminians, againſt whoſe Sophiſms and impoſtures, theſe two Champions ſo excellently and famouſly propugned the truth of Chriſt; hath more deviated from their doctrine, *i. e.* the Doctrine of Chriſt which they defended, than Maſter *Baxter*: how is not then himſelf infamous in reference to that for which he pronounceth them famous? Or in granting them at the higheſt, the name of Theologers, doth he not inure upon himſelf the brand of a Theologaſter? But peradventure he thus inſignizeth them in reſpect of the opinion that others have of them, though in his own accompt, or in compariſon with himſelf, he knowes not whither to terme them Cranes or Pigmies. Or it is a peece of that ſubtlety which elſewhere he uſeth frequently, to abuſe the ignorant with a conceit, that all which he delivers is orthodox, becauſe of his pretending himſelf to be an admirer of ſuch, in whom verity and Godlines with profoundneſs in learning are met together. Or laſtly, Ambition of popular glory and praiſe, might invite him ſo to magnify them; The greater the Champions are with whom he Combateth; The more glorious he may conceive his victory to be, if he return out of the field Conqueror; And he might expect that the leſſer and lower rank will be as mute as fiſhes, when they ſee the Claſſicall Doctors of higheſt eſteem once battered by his diſputations. Two Kings could not ſtand before him, how ſhall we ſtand? 2. *Kin.* 10. 4. ſo *&c.* However it be, all that know them, and him, will conclude certainly that hee doth in no wiſe ſo ſpeak of them, becauſe he can ſay of them in the words of *Iohn*, *whom I love in the truth.* 3. Jo. 1.

But note ye, out of the ſame mouth, in the ſame breath come

Bleſſing and Curſing. The *Kiſs and the ſtab of* Joab *go together.* Majeſtically rather than Magiſterially he mounts them to the top of the Stage, to hurl them down thence in the ſame Momus headleſs. Maſter *Pemble* long ſince while he was yet a young man, ſl pt in Chriſt. But Doctor *Twiſſe* not untill of late in a venerable old age was laid in the grave, and Maſter *Baxter* a Punie to him, throwes his curſes after him, that he was erroneous, hereticall, yea, one that ſet up the Pillar of that which he calls and deteſteth as the worſt of Hereſies, [Antinomianiſm] Dared he but to have whiſpered ſo while Doctor *Twiſſe* was yet living? It is come to paſſe what I conceived, and intimated to divers of my friends at the firſt coming abroad of Doctor *Twiſſe* his works, that during his life we ſhould finde none that would write againſt him; but after his death, there would be many cenſurers, though never an anſwerer of him. Our eyes have ſeene ſince his death brought forth into the light thoſe Tractates, which while he lived, dared not come forth out of the womb of darkneſſe: And thoſe mouths now open after his death, to ſnarl at him, which for fear of him were as faſt ſhut while he lived, as the *Egyptian doggs at the preſence of an Iſraelite.* Exo. 11.7. yet may ſome take it to argue an ignoble Spirit in Maſter *Baxter*, ſo to tread on the neck of a dead Lion, having not ſo much as looked thorow the Grate upon him while yet living; and to ſeek honour by the Conqueſt of them,

Quorum Flaminiâ tegitur cinis atque Latinâ.

But there is but little harm, where there is but barking onely without biting. And how little impreſſion upon Doctor *Twiſſe* his either Doctrine or reputation, Maſter *Baxters* ſugillation hath made, we have in part, and in generall ſeen already, and may yet take notice more particularly.

2. Then when in oppoſition to Doctor *Twiſſe* his Major propoſition, [*vizt.* All Acts immanent in God are Eternal] he tells us that [Immanent in God] muſt needs be taken Negatively, not Poſitively;

§. To ſpeake more ſcripturally, than Metaphyſically.

I anſwer, I ſee no ground of ſuch a neceſſity: but that it may be underſtood as well poſitively, as, yea rather poſitively than Nega-

Negatively. What is immanent in God, but abiding or reſiding in God, or (to uſe the Scripture terms) hidden in God? *Eph.* 3. 9. *Col.* 3. 3. Yet ſo that when it is revealed, it abides notwithſtanding, and hath its immanency in God ſtill. Approbation, Acceptation, accounting us juſt, and loving us in Chriſt, are Acts of Gods Knowledge and will; and both before and after, we have the revelation thereof to our ſoules; they are immanent and abiding in God from everlaſting to everlaſting. Are there not immanent Acts in the ſoul of man? much more in the minde and will of God. *What man knoweth the things of a man, but the Spirit of man which is in him? Even ſo none knoweth the things of God, but the Spirit of God*, ſaith the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 2. 11. By the things of God, and the things of a man, I doubt not but it will be granted, that we muſt underſtand the apprehenſions, volitions, purpoſes, and affections (if I may ſo ſpeak) of God and of men. And are not theſe things in God, as well as the things of God? So they are as properly termed Acts immanent in God in a poſitive ſenſe, as actually abiding in God, as in a Negative, in oppoſition to their Tranſiency and termination upon a ſubject without God: The latter is not onely, or ſo much denyed, as the former affirmed. And thus our juſtification is poſitively and depoſitively immanent in God from eternity. *Poſited in the boſom of God the Father, as in the Cabbinet of his counſells: and depoſited in the hand of God the Son, as in the hand of a faithfull Mediator and ſurety for us, upon his undertaking to make ſatisfaction, which God the Father accepted as preſent ſatisfaction made for our ſinns.*

3. The reaſon which he annexeth, to prove that Acts are not poſitively immanent in God, is inſufficient and reaſonleſſe. For *Acts* (ſaith he) *have not the reſpect of an Adjunct to its ſubject, but of an effect to its Cauſe.* As if Acts and effects could not alſo abide and remain in their cauſe. Maſter *Baxter* (no doubt) hath read *Bellarmine*, *Arminius*, and *Corvinus*, in their diſputes againſt the Doctrine of the reformed Churches: ſuppoſe now an act of approbation hath paſſed within him ſo far, as that their Faith is become his Faith alſo, but ſecretly and not fully yet manifeſted to the World: Is not this approbation an Act of Maſter *Baxter*? if ſo, is it not alſo an immanent Act abiding in himſelfe within his owne minde, as well poſitively

the reſiding, as negatively not tranſient upon thoſe Writers to produce any new relation or paſſion in them? Himſelfe, and his Maſter *Grotius* concurre, *That the effects of efficient voluntarie cauſes do not alway immediately follow them*; *That God hath decreed from eternity the tranſient Juſtification of the Elect in their own conſciences, yet the execution thereof follows not until they beleeve.* Theſ. 15. and its Explication, and here againe pag. 177. I demand now where this decree, this act lyeth hid untill the execution thereof? It muſt be either no where, and conſequently null, and annihilated, or elſe abide ſtill, and bee Immanent in God, and ſo what was in God from eternity, is immanent in him from eternity, and continued untill the full execution thereof; That very pactional Juſtification, which is by Faith, being nothing but the execution of the decree of God from eternity. For beſides our eternal Juſtification in Chriſt before mentioned, we acknowledge alſo an eternall decree in God to declare and evidence his Elect juſtified in their own conſciences. *i. e.* in time to ſend forth his Spirit into them, and by his Spirit to work Faith in them, and ſo to draw them unto Chriſt, and by the evidence of Faith, and evidence of the Spirit to declare themſelves to themſelves to be juſtified, and pardoned for ever.

As for that of the reſpect of the Adjunct to its Subject, we leave to Maſter *Baxter*, and his friends the Arminians. They indeed make Pardon and Juſtification to bear the nature of Adjuncts, yea ſeparable Adjuncts, and Accidents of God, which may *adeſſe, vel abeſſe ſine deſtructione ſubjecti*, that God may hate one day even to damn, and love the next day to ſave, and the third day convert this love into hatred againe, and ſo conſequently change more frequently then the Moon, and yet be God ſtill. Such ſhall we find Mr. *Baxters* doctrine, ſuckt out by kiſſing from the lips of the Arminians: But I forbear to ſpeak further of it here, reſerving it for its proper place.

4. As to the inſtances which he giveth, to make queſtionable whether Imanent Acts are eternall; viz. *For God to know that the world doth now exiſt, that ſuch a man is ſanctified, or juſt*, &c. *Gods foreknowledge is not a knowing that ſuch a thing is, which is not, but that ſuch a thing will be, which is not.* I an-

ſwer

swer that foreknowledge doth still imply, and connote know-
ledge, though knowledge doth not so imply foreknowledge.
He that perfectly in every respect foreknew an Eclipse, in e-
very point of its time, measure, *&c.* knew it also perfectly,
and could as fully, and perfectly contemplate, and speak of it
in its fruition as presence, future, and present, it was, and is
one to him. Much more in God, who hath created time for
the measure of his creatures, not his own being and motion.
Past, present, and future are much to us, whose existence, du-
ration, and motions, are spanned, and spinned out by mo-
ments. But to God who is eternall, dwels in eternity, is eter-
nity, not circumscribed with place or time, there is nothing
former, or latter, no succession, of present to past, of future to
present, but all at once, and at one view apparent to his eye,
or knowledge: So that albeit he speakes oft in Scriptures to
our capacitie of succession of times, as if he together with us
did act within the bounds thereof (else if he should speake stil
in reference to things of old, and things hereafter [to us] as
he eternall *I AM*, not I was, or I will bee, our weakness
would be beneath the comprehension of what he saith) Yet these
circumstances of time doe adde nothing to, take nothing from,
nor properly square with him that is above time, without
the precincts of time, comprehends time, and temporary
things within himself, and is not comprehended, or touched
by them. The now existence of the world, the now sanctifi-
cation of such a man, are *now, and new* in the knowledge of the
creature, not the Creator. Or let Mr. *Baxter* deny the world
in that form, state, extent, fulness, &c. in which it doth now
exist; or the now either sanctified, or just man, or the mea-
sure and nature of his Justification, to have been from all e-
ternity, as apparent to Gods knowledge, as it is in this *now*, or
present time of us his creatures.

5. The comparisons or similitudes which hee bringeth of
the Sun, the glass, the eye, though they may have some appea-
rance of freeing God from change in taking new notions into
his knowledge in time (which notwithstanding is but an ap-
pearance) yet is there nothing in them from which to argue to
the acts in general which are immanent in God. These do but
set forth the respect of natural causes, and their natural effects,
either

either to other, therefore are in a capacity to illustrate only those acts that flow naturally, and therewithall necessarily from God: Not those that proceed from the liberty and freedom of his will, (which Master *Baxter* calls Morall Acts, and Morall Causes) For of these there can be no Cause assigned but the free will of God. And if they serve not Master *Baxters* turn in this respect, they become utterly unusefull to him in the point of Justification. Yet to this end doth he drive, that God doth justifie and unjustifie, pardon, and unpardon, change his will from love to hatred, and from hatred to love, to will the salvation of the same man at one time, and his damnation at another, without any change of his will, or in himself: The absurdity and impossibility whereof we shall afterward shew, when Master *Baxter* in his following Theses gives me cause to do it. So much of what he saith by way of answer to the Major, or more properly what he saith to leave it unanswered. For after all he concludes, *But grant that all Gods immanent Acts are Eternall.* And this is as much as if he had said; All that hath been said is of no force to refell it, Therefore I grant it.

As for his answer to the Minor [*That Remission and Justification are immanent Acts in God*] though he speak much, yet is it nothing to the pupose.

First he tells us that most Divines will deny it, and tell you that they are transient Acts; which is true. An irrefragable Argument, most will say it, *Ergo* it is true. True, because most *will* say it, though hitherto possibly they have never said it. And how knowes he they *Will* say it? Peradventure he puts so much confidence in his following dispute, that he accounts all will be captivated by it into his opinion. Or if he mean the most Divines have said it, hee questionlesse means partly the Jesuitical Divines, (for so *Bellarmine* indeed, with others of the same School asserts:) or else more primarily the Arminian Divines speaking in this point what they have learned of *Socinus*, who is as great with them as was *Simon Magus* with the Samaritans. Yet even these also, though they sometimes deny, yet do they also sometimes (when it may make for their advantage) affirm Justification to be an immanent Act in God.

2. Who is there that sees not his sophistry in shifting from his

this proposition in stead of answering it? Doctor *Twisse* his proposition is, Justification is an immanent Act in God. To subvert this, Master *Baxter* bestirrs himself to prove a seemingly, but not really contradictory proposition, *viz.* That Justification is a Transient Act of God. A fallacy which in the Schools is called *Ignoratio Elenchi*. And the reasoning of Master *Baxter* here, is as proper and powerful, as if Master *Baxter* should affirm that *Apollo* was above a hundred years old; and I to overthrow his conclusion, should assert, and prove, that *Apollo* had never a beard. There is no contradiction between these two assertions; A man may be old, and yet be without a beard: So to affirm that Justification is a transient, doth not contradict, that Justification is immanent in God. For both are true, and may concurre without dashing either in the other. The Eternall Justification deposited in Christ, upon the Covenant made between the Father and the Son is immanent in God. But that Justification, which according to the tenor of the New Covenant made with man, is declared and evidenced by God unto the Conscience of man, is a transient Act of God: So that the affirming and confirming of the latter doth not contradict the former, but is a meer sophism, an ἑτεροζήτησις, a flinching to another question; which I take to be in substance the same with the before named fallacy.

And so Master *Baxter* doth but *Oleum & Operam perdere*, toyl much & catch nothing in disputing so profoundly and Metaphysically, *pa.* 175. about the Doctrine of Relation, and *pa.* 176. to make our, according to that Doctrine, a possible, probable, Transient Justification, which is a conclusion that is granted him without dispute. And yet the grant of it doth not at all weaken the Minor proposition of Doctor *Twisse*, *That Remission and Justification* (in the sense oft mentioned) *are Acts immanent in God.* The *Subjectum*, *Fundamentum*, *Terminus*, together with the *Ratio Fundandi*, are no more wanting in Gods Eternall justifying us in Christ, than in his Temporaneous justifying us declaratively and evidentially to our own Consciences, and might be no lesse confidently upon as good grounds of Reason particularized; if we delighted (as Master *Baxter* doth) to bring Gods Acts under the rule and measure of the termes of humane Art and learning. Which notwithstanding, if wee either

would not or could not do, our Faith ſhould in no wiſe ſtumble, but having the infallible word of God for its foundation (which we have before ſeen, notwithſtanding all that Maſter *Baxter* hath ſaid againſt it, to be for us,) it ought on it to reſt, contemning all the pillarage of humane reaſon and wiſdome, to lean thereon for ſuſtentation.

In like manner the whole ſumme of Maſter *Baxters* diſpute, *pa.* 177, 178, 179, 180. ſpent in raiſing and overthrowing an objection ſo raiſed, about a thing never queſtioned, is altogether impertinent to the queſtion in hand. None denies the concluſion, or objects againſt it in that manner, or any thing at all to the ſubſtance of it: So that Maſter *Baxter* doth here but make knots to looſe them, and fight againſt the Air, which never accepted of a Combat with him. Neither is there any other, or new thing in this peece of his diſpute, that hath not had before a ſufficient examination and Anſwer.

At length, *pa.* 180, & 181. he doth in a manner unſay all that he hath ſaid, and confeſſe that his whole diſpute, is little to the purpoſe, and therefore doth more than half grant the queſtion to them whom he hath made his adverſaries; For theſe are his words.

B. *The ſecond kind of Gods acts, which may be called Juſtifying, is indeed immanent*; viz. *his knowing the ſinner to be pardoned and juſt*; *His willing and approving hereof as true and good: Theſe are acts in Heaven, yea, in God himſelf: but the former ſort are on earth alſo. I would not have thoſe Acts of God ſeparated which he doth conjoin. And he ever doth theſe laſt with the former. But I verily thinke that it is eſpecially the former tranſient legall Acts, which the Scripture uſually means, when it ſpeakes of pardoning and (conſtitutive) juſtifying, and not theſe immanent Acts: though theſe muſt be looked on as concurrent with the former. Yet moſt Divines that I meet with, ſeeme to look at pardon and juſtification as being done in Heaven onely, and conſiſting onely in theſe latter immanent Acts. And yet they deny juſtification to be an immanent Act too. But how*

how they will ever manifest that the Celestiall Acts of God, (vizt. *his willing the sinners pardon, and so forgiving him in his own brest; or his accepting him as just) are transient Acts, I am yet unable to understand. And if they be immanent acts, most will grant that they are from Eternity. And then fair fall the Antinomians,* &c.

I know not of two things considerable in these words of Master *Baxter*, which is more considerable, either the power and victory of truth against his will convincing his Conscience, or his hatefull and desperate detestation of the truth, when his Conscience is convinced thereof. The conviction of his Conscience, that it is the truth which he hath here oppugned, is sufficiently manifested in this, that he confesseth

1. That *Gods knowing the sinner to be pardoned and justified, his willing and approving hereof to be true and good (and a little after) his willing of the sinners pardon, forgiving him in his own brest, and accepting him as just, to be Celestiall Acts, Acts in heaven, yea in God himself, indeed immanent.*

2. *That he seeth not how they can ever be manifested to be transient Acts.*

2. *And if immanent Acts, most will grant (and himself hath nothing to contradict) that they are from Eternity.* His willfull hatred of this truth so confessed, is plainly enough hinted in these words. *Then fair fall the Antinomians, i. e.* then in despight of the Devill, yea malice it self, the Assertors of this truth abide unquenched, yea untouched. This torments his spirit, and makes him to gnash with the teeth in fury, like him that cryed; *O Galilean, thou hast the Victory.*

He will not have *those acts of God to be separated which he doth conjoyn.* And who ever separated, or was so madd as to divide Gods Knowledge and Will from his either immanent or transient Acts? that hath ever said that God in imputing our sinnes (in reference to punishment) to Christ Jesus, in forgiving, absolving, and accepting the sinner, hath done either he knowes not what, or that which he would not, willeth not? But to conjoyn what the Lord hath divided in point of time, his constitutive justifying us in his own brest thorow Christ before time, with his

declarative juſtifying us in our own conſciences in time, were to confound heaven and earth, eternity and time, together in one. The queſtion is not, whether when God hath by a tranſient act juſtified a ſinner, he knoweth and willeth his juſtification? But whether God did not both knowingly and willingly ſo juſtifie and pardon him through Chriſt, within his own breſt from eternity? or whether Gods accepting him in Chriſt, and knowing him to be ſo accepted, be begotten in the will and mind of God now in the end of time, and ſo God is not the ſame God in his Knowledge and Will, which he was from eternity?

He verily thinks that the tranſient Acts of God are meant in thoſe Scriptures which ſpeak of juſtification by faith, (for ſo I conceive he would be underſtood.) And I verily think that he is not enough ſound in his head-peece, whoſoever thinks the contrary. For it were a mad contradictive propoſition to ſay, whoſoever doth, or ſhall beleeve, ſhall be juſtified in himſelfe before he had a ſelf, or being. But this is no nearer to the matter in queſtion, than the North is to the South pole.

As for that barr of God in heaven, that hee concludes with; where his Angelical and Seraphical Doctors that better know the way thence than thither, ſaw at their laſt coming thence, God ſitting and tranſacting theſe things before his Angels, we are bidden to wait untill he ſhall have the leiſure after he hath ſpoken once more with *Lucians Icaro-Menippus,* and enquired of him the certainty thereof, and then we ſhall hear the dream interpreted.

This is the ſumme of his noble diſpute againſt juſtification, as an act immanent in God from Eternity. And now I appeal to the reader, comparing together his bigg and ſwelling promiſe with his curt and inſubſtantial performance; *after his challenge of all the* Antinomians, his promiſe to *ſhew that there is no ſuch thing, his charging the doctrine with the ſcandalous* terms of *errour, and pillar of* Antinomianiſm, & his undertaking to prove it ſuch; upon due examination to judge,

Quid tanto dignum tulit hic [*Promiſſor*] *hiatu?*

CHAP.

Chap. XXII.

Arg. *What the reall Antinomians have been, and are, and that Master* Baxter *casteth this reproachfull name upon all the Churches of Christ, charging the innocent with the fault whereof himself is guilty.*

THE second thing which I promised to take into examination, in his explication of this Thesis, is his vellication of the Antinomians, which here and elsewhere throughout this Book he defieth with unquenchable hatred, charging and discharging so hotly against them, as ever *Jupiter* did against the Giants that made a battery against the Heavens. And what are they, that *Goliah* like, he should come harnessed from the head to the foot, brandishing his weavers beam against them? he tells us, *They* are *Ignorant* [animals] *pa.* 169. *Fitter to learn the grounds of Religion in a Catechism, than to manage those disputes wherewith they trouble the world.* pa. 115. If so, who can abstain from laughter, to see so great a Nimrod as Mr. *Baxter*, hunting, with no lesse weapon then *Hercules* his Club, a nest of wrens to death? and with the great Monarch of the World *Domitian*, to set himself in battel array against the gnats and flies that dared to peep into his chamber.

But his aim is to shew his Craft more than his power, as I before in part have manifested in the preface to this examination, and there promised more fully afterward to evidence: The performance whereof, I have reserved for this place.

That we may the better discern Master *Baxters* either singlenesse or doublenesse in this Case, it shall be somewhat expedient to enquire after, first the originall, secondly the growth of the Antinomians properly so taken and denominated in the severall reformed Churches, untill our late divisions within this land have made such a medly and confusion of all, or at least many errors together, that we know not punctually what error is predominant in most of the willfully erroneous: that having seene

them both in their birth, and their full height also; wee may compare Master *Baxters* Antinomians with the Antinomians indeed, and so judge how far he goes about to confute the innocent, and how far to defame and deceive the innocent.

The first rise of them was in *Germany*, *Anno. Dom.* 1538. as *Sleidan* in the 12 Book of his Commentaries tells us. Their principall ringleader was *Ioannes Islebius, Agricola.* I have not met with any of their Books, neither know I whether there be any of them extant, from which we may certainly gather their opinions. Wee are forced therefore to take them at the second hand from the foresaid Author, who in the forequoted place thus speaks of them. *Hoc Anno secta prodijt eorũ qui dicuntur Antinomi. Hi pœnitentiam ex Decalogo non esse docendam aiunt, & illos impugnant qui docent non esse prædicandum Evangelium, nisi primum quassatis animis, atque fractis per prædicationem legis. Ipsi verò statuunt quacunque tandem sit hominis vita, & quamtumvis impura, justificari tamen eum, si modò promissionem Evangelij credat.* i. e. This year sprung forth the sect of those which are called Antinomians. [Their Tenents he reduceth to three generall heads, telling us that first] They say, *that Repentance is not to be taught out of the Decalogue*: [2] They impugn them that teach, the Gospell ought not to be preached to men, untill their hearts be first shaken and broken by the preaching of the Law. [3] They assert that whatsoever the life of a man be, and how impure soever, yet is he justified if he only believeth the promises of the Gospel.

He addeth further, that *Luther* wrote against this *Islebius*, who thereupon submitted, and in a sort recanted; and so it seemes the Sect ceased, and their assertions for a while slept.

Such were they at their first rise. In these after times, they discovered themselves in more plain terms than *Sleidan* here discovered them. About twenty years since, I had acquaintance, and upon that acquaintance, much reasoning, and many disputes with some of them in *Summersetshire*, who much honoured, and professed themselves to have received their light from that Master *Wootton*, whom Master *Baxter* doth seem much to applaud in some parts of this Treatise. Their opinions that partly were, and partly were taken by the most to be points of Antinomianism were these, (as in discourse with them I found them to maintain)

1. The

1. That the Law is totally abrogated now under the Gospel, and that not onely as a Covenant of Works, but also from being any more the rule of righteousnesse. That wee have but one Master, Christ, that since his coming into the world, he is our Teacher sent from heaven: the Prophet raised up like to *Moses*, that we should hear him alone. That since the time he began to speak, *Moses* hath been silent, and we are bound now to attend to *the voice of God, as in these latter times he speaketh to us by his Son only.*

2. That the whole Old Testament is (as it were) uncanonized, though it were the Word of God, the Rule and Canon of Faith, and practice, to them that lived under it; yet to us that are under the Gospel it remains not in its former power. Because the Last Will and Testament onely stands in force, and when a later Testament is made, the former is thereby to all uses and purposes made voyd. We may read the Old Testament as other Apocryphal, and Ecclesiasticall Writings, but must no more subject our judgements or consciences to it, then to these: For *Moses and the Prophets prophecied* (onely) *untill John the Baptist*, were in force untill he began to preach the Gospel, and ever since the *Kingdom of heaven hath suffered violence*, the doctrine of the Gospel hath succeeded in its place.

3. That we have no Sabbath under the Gospel, but all holynesse in dayes, and difference between dayes and dayes is taken away; so that to sanctifie any one day to the Lord above another, is meer Wil-worship, and Superstition. Upon this ground they actually made use of shooting, bowling, and other lawful recreations upon the Lords day, pronouncing it to be a use of the Liberty which Christ had purchased for them.

4. They disrelished altogether that phrase of Justification by Faith, as attributing somewhat to man; and would that all should rather say that we are Justified by Grace, or by Christ or by being found in Christ, or by our union unto Christ, that the praise of our Justification might be reserved whole and entire to the Grace of God in Christ alone.

5. That we are justified by the Passive, not the Active obedience of Christ.

6. That God seeth no sinne in the justified, he knows indeed when they sinne, and that they have sinned, but he doth not see it because themselves and it are covered under the righteousnes, and

and croſs of Chriſt, ſo that the Father doth not, will not ſee it. As if the eternal God had any other eyes beſides the eyes of his knowledge to ſee; or that Gods ſeeing, and his knowing were at leaſt diſparats, and not the ſame thing.

7. That God puniſheth not ſinne in his people, for he ſeeth not ſin in his people, and what he ſeeth not, that he cannot puniſh. He hath puniſhed it upon Chriſt, therefore are they free from puniſhment.

8. That whatſoever is not in preciſe words forbidden in the New Teſtament, that is lawfull for a Chriſtian to doe, how ſtrictly ſoever it be prohibited in the Law, and Old Teſtament. So that I have taken notice that when in diſputes, ſuch and ſuch things have been denyed to be expreſly forbidden in the New Teſtament, and that they could not finde any clear teſtimonies of the New Teſtament literally forbidding them; though before they made it a caſe of conſcience to abſtain, yet thenceforth, notwithſtanding all that is ſaid in the Old Teſtament againſt it, they have taken full liberty to commit it.

Theſe things were formerly (as farre as I have taken notice) either all, or the chief things, branded with the name of Antinomianiſm. And they that held them were called by the moſt Antinomiſts, or Antinomians, becauſe either in all, or moſt of theſe aſſertions, they either did, or ſeemed to oppoſe, and ſet themſelves againſt the Law, or Old Teſtament.

In theſe laſt ſeven or eight years indeed, wherein all the Ghoſts of all the Hereticks of former Ages have been let looſe from hell in full ſwarms, to infeſt this Nation more then ever the Locuſts did the Land of *Egypt*; and men in wantonizing againſt Chriſt and his Truth, have thought it too little to be Satans budget-bearers in ſome, except they had their packs filled with all varieties of his hell-bred errors, ſo that the Legion of Devils now might be found ſometimes in one man, which heretofore was diſtributed into a legion of men: By means whereof, many Hereſies moulded together have gone under one denomination; partly through ignorance, and partly out of malice, both all the dreames of mad Enthuſiaſts, and blaſphemies againſt the Word ſometimes, and ſometimes the very ſacred truths of the Goſpel of Chriſt have been expoſed to the hatred of the multitude under the title of Antinomianiſm: Men full of all ſubtiltie and miſchief thus painting Chriſt in the midſt of many

many Devils, that he might be taken for one of them, and the truth of his Gospel bee abandoned under the name of Heresie.

But as to the forementioned tenents in former times charged with Antinomianism, I shall say something.

First those three mentioned by *Sleidan*, as he expresseth them, it is very ambiguous whether they were truths or errors. Because the words by which he describes them, are ambiguous: and may be taken either in a good, or evill sense.

1. That they taught that Repentance is not to be taught out of the Decalogue: It is doubtfull what his meaning is; 1. Whether they denyed it to be taught simply, or *secundum quid*, either that it ought not to be thence taught at all, or not to be taught thence, as ordained and effectual to justification, and salvation? 2. It is doubtfull also what hee meanes by the Decalogue, whether he means the Ten Commandements considered strictly in their own words, as meer Law (for so I see not how repentance can be taught properly out of the Decalogue, because it commandeth perfect obedience, that there may be no need of repentance) or as the Doctrine of the said Decalogue is amplified, and expounded in other Scriptures: where we shall find indeed Repentance required in case of transgression, with a promise of temporall deliverances and blessings annexed; and so the teaching of Repentance out of the Law be here opposed to the teaching of it out of the Gospel, and consequentially the Legall be here opposed to the Evangelical Repentance? 3. Or whether his meaning be, that they would not have repentance at all taught, because they took it to be a meerly Legall, not an Evangelicall duty, therefore pertaining to the administration of the Law, not of the Gospel? I conceive the Historian being a man singular for his moderation in all that he writes, though he speaks of their opinion in the easiest words he may, yet meanes that they held it in the worst sense, (And such have been the Antinomians in these latter times) otherwise in a good sense, that his words will bear, this first tenet deserves not the name of Antinomianism, or error.

To the second, if his meaning be, that they impugned those that preached the Law to shake the hearts of men into self-denial, and to break down the proud confidence of safety, and righteousnesse in themselves, thereby to make way for the doctrine

ctrine of Christ into them: There is something indeed worthy of blame layd to their charge. But if we take his words strictly as they lye, *viz.* that they opposed them *which teach that the Gospel is not to be preached untill the Law hath so convinced, and shaken the conscience*, &c. I professe my self to be an Antinomian also, if this be Antinomianism. For what warrant hath any Minister so to teach? The commission which we receive from Christ is, *to preach the Gospel to every creature in all the world.* Mar. 16. 15. without any restriction whether they be shaken, or unshaken: And if we continue Law-shakers still among some people, untill wee see them thereby shaken into a Palsie of self-despairing, I know no ground we have to promise to our selves a time of preaching Gospel so long as we live. And what answer can be given in such a case to Christ for following our own carnall wisdome, and not his commission? Neither was it one of *Luthers* praises (*pace tanti viri dixerim*) from the experience of Gods working upon himself, which was first the laying of him prostrate by the Law under great horrors, and then reviving him with the precious comforts of the Gospel; to prescribe unto God the same method, or to conclude the same to bee the method of God in his operations upon all in converting them. The rending whirlwind doth not alway goe before the quickening beams of the *Sun of Righteousness.*

To the third, if he mean that they taught that Justification by Faith in the Gospel promises might be sound and effectuall, though no sanctification, but all allowed impurity of life should follow; the assertion and doctrine implies a contradiction; for there can be no living Faith in the promises, that is not fruitfull in good works: And herein they declared themselves no lesse Anti-Gospellers, then Antinomians. But if hee meane that without all such extream horrors of the Law, a man may be truly justified by Faith in Christ, notwithstanding all his former loose and impure life, and so the Publicans and Harlots enter into the Kingdome of God before the self-righteous Pharisees; this is not Antinomistick, except *Pauls* doctrine also be such, *Rom.* 4. 5.

2. As for those opinions charged in these latter times with Antinomianism by many, the 1, 2, and last cannot be excused. Onely (to give the Assertors their due) whatsoever of doctrinall truths to be beleeved, or of Moral duties to be practised, are ex-

pressed

pressed both in the Old and New Testament, they were conscientious to submit themselves thereunto, yet not for the authority of the Law, or Old Testament, but of the New only.

The third can bee justly charged with Antinomianism no farther, then as either the Maintainers of it were in other points Antinomists, or in respect of the foundation, which they laid to maintain it, which was the abrogation of the Law and old Testament. The Law of the Sabbath being one part therof, which must stand or sink with the rest. But as they denyed the lawfulness of all discrimination or difference of daies, by way of Morall, or Ecclesiastical, or Apostolical order, for the more orderly, and profitable celebration of publick Assemblies, and the ordinances of Christ in publick Communion, calling it Will-worship, and Superstition: This error they drew from the *Petrobusians*, and *Anabaptists*, not from the *Antinomians* that had been before them. As to other questions about the authority of the Sabbath first, & now of the Lordsday, what relation they have either to other, whether the observation of them be of Natural, or Positive right: If of Moral and Natural right, by what express authority it is altered from the last, to the first day of the week? If of Positive right, whether it began from the Creation, or from the Law given upon Mount *Sinai*? Whether the fourth Commandement hath any thing in it Typical, now vanished in Christ? Or whether wholly Moral, and binding for ever? how far it did, or did not bind precisely to *a* day, & not *this* day of 7? Whether it were of Moral Righteousnes, or else only of Moral order? Whether the holyness of the 7th be now wholly translated upon the first day of the week? By what authority the observation of the seventh day ceased, and of the first day of the week was instituted to succeed? Whether by virtue of Christs Resurrection, or by some express command of Christ? and where that command is to bee found? Or else by Apostolical appointment? And then whether in respect of order, or of the aforegoing authority of Gods Commandement about the Sabbath? or else by the appointment and consent of the Churches in, or after the Apostles times? These, and many other the like questions Mr. *Baxter* knoweth to have been in agitation between both the greater and the lesser Divines and Members of the Reformed Churches, *& adhuc sub judice Lis est*. Onely some within the Church of *England*, ever since a Tractate came forth upon this subject from one Dr. *Bownd*, *Anno*

Christi 1595. seem to fix the observation of the Lords day upon more strict grounds, and to bind it to more precise termes then the other Reformed Churches beyond the seas admit, or many of the solid Divines have approved. But of this there is no proper occasion here given to dispute. This assertion therefore, any further then hath been specified, I doubt not but Mr. *Baxter* himself will discharge of Antinomianism.

The 5. & 7. Mr. *Baxter* himself will not have to be ranked among Antinomian errors, confessing the former to be the judgement of many learned, and godly Divines, of singular esteem in the Church of God, pag. 53. & Ap. pag. 12. The latter hee pronounceth to be the Common Judgement, *viz.* of Churches, and Divines; therefore of ignorance accused of Antinomianism, pag. 68 of his Aphorisms.

The fourth gives us cause to accuse them of some audaciousnes, in teaching the Holy Ghost to speake, and pertinaciousnes in binding themselves to phrases and words, even to the declining of the language of the Holy Ghost in Scriptures. To be justified by Faith, and to bee justified by Christ, or our being found in Christ, being ever both in Canonical, and Ecclesiastical Writings taken as Equipollent terms, until in these few last years Mr. *Bax.* and some of his fellows irradiated from *Rome*, and by the doctrine of *Socinus*, and *Arminius*, have broached another, a new, and unheard of interpretation of the phrases. For whether we say we are justified by Faith, wee were formerly understood to affirm our Justification by Christ, to whom our Faith hath united us; or by Christ, it was understood by Christ apprehended by faith. Neither manner of Locution therefore was to be rejected, as opposing the other.

The sixth I take to be a fancy (if they understand Gods seeing and knowing in generall, without restriction) troubling the brains of men with a strife about words without substance. God seeth no sin unpardoned upon his people, we acknowledge. In reference to Judgement and Vengeance, hee hath seen them all upon Christ, and punished them upon Christ, so that he no more sees sinne in beleevers, to take vengeance of them for it. But were our loss and misery, if God should not at all, and simply see sinne in us; How then should he purge it from us, and us from it? He is the Husbandman of his Vineyard, sees, and cuts out every canker from his Vines, seeth, and pareth off every unprofitable

profitable sprigg from the branches, by meanes whereof fruitfullnesse followeth, where else there must ensue barrennesse and rottennesse. Some Divines therefore thus distinguish, that Gods seeing of sin may be considered as either in *Articulo providentiæ*, (so he seeth all sinns of all men alike to dispose of them to his glory,) or in *Articulo Justificationis*, (so he seeth the sinnes onely of the unjustified; *Ier.* 18. 23. Forget not their iniquity, neither blot out their sin from thy sight: but the sinnes of the justified are forgotten, and blotted out of his remembrance and sight (as the constant phrase of Scripture affirmeth) no more to be imputed. If they mean onely in this latter sense, they erre not.

By that which hath been said, we may easily perceive (without any further and new summing up the particulars) what the assertions are which may be truly and properly charged with Antinomism, and gave first the Term of Antinomism to the Assertors.

Now let us see also what the Tenents of Master *Baxters* Antinomists are, and what opinions he curseth to Hell, unde the name of Antinomianism. Their Heresies according to Master *Baxter* are these which follow.

1. That Justification is, or there is a Justification from Eternity. *pag.* 93.

2. That it is an immanent act in God. *pa.* 173.

3. That our Evangelicall righteousnesse by which we are justified, is without us in Christ. *pa.* 109. or performed by Christ, and not by our selves. *pa.* 111.

4. That Justification is a free act of God, without any condition on our part. *pa.* 169, 170.

5. That God seeth not sin in his justified ones, *pa.* 207.

6. That we must not work or perform duties for life and salvation, but from life and salvation: or that we must not make the attaining of justification, or salvation, an end of our endeavours, but obey in thankfullnesse onely, because we are saved and justified. *pa.* 324, 325. 330.

7. That they acknowledge no condition of life, but bare belief in the narrowest sense, that is, either belief of pardon, and justification, and Reconciliation, or affiance in Christ, for it: so also they acknowledg no proper damning sin, but unbelief, in that strict sense, as is opposite to this faith, *i.e.* the not believing in Christ as our Saviour. *Append. pa.* 20, 21.

8. To these he addeth many more, (or rather mostly the same

in other Termes) out of the Marrow of Modern Divinity, (I mean the book ſo entitled) which in due place we may as far as ſhall be thought needfull, examine. *Appen. pa.* 100. to *pa.* 106.

Laſtly, he ſeems to accuſe them of all the prodigious Doctrines which *Colyer*, *Spriggs*, *Hobſon*, and the reſt of that Anabaptiſtical, Enthuſiaſticall, and phanatick ſtrain of men, have (if indeed they be of them that have at any time) ſaid and unſaid; whether ſuch as they have derived from *Nicolas Stock*, *David George*, *Thomas Muncer*, *John* of *Leyden*, *Cniperdolins*, &c. and others of the ſame ſtamp in theſe latter times: or ſuch as either of them hath by a kind of Necromancy raiſed up from the aſhes of *Manes*, *Samoſatenus*, *Arrius*, and other curſed Hereticks of antient times. All theſe he would willingly inure upon the Antinomians, *i. e.* upon them that will not ſay the ſame things with him, who ſpeaks the ſame things with the Jeſuits in the point of Juſtification. This he doth ſubtlely, and underhand, to beguile his unwary reader. *Append. pa.* 99.

Of all theſe onely the fift hath been (as far as ever I cou'd finde) by any conſiderate and judicious perſon, nicknamed with Antinomiſm, untill Maſter *Baxter* and ſome other of his fellows in theſe late years have taken upon them a Soveraignty, as Lords and judges from *Peters* Chair, which they have Canonized again, to baptiſe with new names, all the Doctrines of the Goſpell that croſſe the pride of their ſelfe-ighteouſneſſe.

And even the fift it ſelf in Scripture ſenſe (as I have before ſhewed) is a Soul-comforting truth, which we muſt no more ſuffer to be wreſted from us, than our Chriſt and all our happineſſe by him, *vizt.* that God ſeeth not ſin in his juſtified ones, to impute it, to hate and condemn them for it. Hee ſeeth not the guilt of any ſin upon them, having laid it and the condemnation to which it obliged, upon Chriſt Jeſus. But that God doth not ſimply ſee ſin in them, either Originall or Actuall, to act about it in a way of grace and truth, according to his promiſes in Chriſt; This I take to be a foppery, the fruit of mens willfullneſſe, and pertinacity, to have their own words and phraſes ſtand as impregnable as Chriſts truth lapt up in them. Let it be called Antinomiſm, or Antigoſpelliſm, or what elſe Maſter *Baxter* will ſtile it; I ſhall not herein withſtand him; To me the truth and ſpirit of the Doctrines conteined in the word, ſufficeth, the letter I ſhall no further propugn or oppugn, than as through it the ſpirit and truth is levelled at.

To

To the firſt and ſecond I have before ſpoken, and let any man upon earth be produced, that ever charged them with Antinomianiſm, ſaving Maſter *Baxter* himſelfe, or one of his Diſciples: And if they be Antinomian Tenents, then is Maſter *Baxter* one of thoſe Antinomians, being forced after his long and impotent ſtill againſt, at laſt to grant both; as wee have before ſeen.

To the third, I have alſo before anſwered. Neither hath Maſter *Baxter* named, nor can he (I am confident) name one man, but either a Papiſt, or at beſt an Arminian, that before him hath either called Faith and Goſpel obedience the Evangelicall Righteouſneſſe by which we are juſtified: Or that hath denyed our goſpell righteouſneſſe by which we are juſtified to be without us, in Chriſt. So that he pronounceth here all the orthodox of all Churches, yea, all profeſſed Chriſtians, ſaving Papiſts, Arminians, and (perhaps) Socinians to be Antinomians: So much of Antichriſtian pride and impudence poſſeſſeth him.

To the fourth and ſeventh I anſwer,

1. That they are contradictory either to other. For how can both be true, that they affirm Juſtification to be a free Act of God without any condition on our part, and yet teach alſo Faith or affiance in Chriſt to be a [neceſſary] condition of our Juſtification? who ſhall take upon him to defend him that arraigneth and proveth himſelf to be a ſlanderer?

2. Yet may it without contradiction be both affirmed, that Juſtification as an act immanent and Eternall in God, is abſolute and without condition, but as it is tranſient and Terminate upon the conſcience of a believer, not to be without condition.

3. Becauſe the Scripture never nameth Faith, much leſſe works, the condition of Juſtification in time; to queſtion whether Faith itſelf may not more properly be termed by ſome other denomination in reference to juſtification, than a Condition, is no peece of Antinomiſm, but a point of Chriſtian prudence to conſider and examine: ſpecially at ſuch a time when Maſter *Baxter* and other of the Popes Factors, under the word *condition* beſtirre themſelves to re-erect Juſtification by works.

4. That Juſtification by that which Maſter *Baxter* abuſingly calleth bare belief, or affiance in Chriſt the Saviour, *i. e.* by Faith without works, is no Antinomian Doctrine, but the Doctrine which Chriſt and *Paul*, and the reſt of the Apoſtles, have preached and

and ſealed with their blood; that which all the reformed Churches have unanimouſly maintained, and do maintain unto this day: and that which Antichriſt with his vaſſalls, and others apoſtatized from the reformed Churches to them do purſue with fire and fury unto ruine. With whom though Mr. *Bax.* come up in the rear, driving Jehu like furiouſly in his Charriot, to deſtroy it, yet ſhall it ſtand impregnable, as the prime Article of their Creed, who either are, or ſhall be juſtified and ſaved.

To the ſixth, I ſhall reſerve my anſwer untill I come to examine the forequoted places of Maſter *Baxter*, together with his impetuous and fiery diſpute againſt it, *Append. pa.* 75. and *thence forward unto* pa. 98. where wee ſhall find him combating against this opinion, with as much gallantry, and poſſibly with no leſſe ſucceſſe than the Dragon fought againſt *Michael.*

In the interim, I doubt not thence (after the queſtion rightly ſtated) to maintain the poſition, as our Divines moſt eminent in the reformed Churches have taught it, to be the ſacred and ſound Doctrine of the Goſpell, as free from Antinomiſm, as the contrary aſſertion of Maſter *Baxter* is full of Popery.

The examination of the things conteined in the eighth and ninth, I ſhall leave to their proper place, particularly to be examined, becauſe they have a multitude of particulars congeſted in them, requiring particular anſwers.

From all that hath been ſaid upon this point, wee may take up two obſervations, in reference to Maſter *Baxters* dealing therein.

1. That there is no truth and ſincerity in his pretence of fighting againſt the Antinomians (truly ſo called) throughout this his Tractate, (For he medleth not at all with their erroneous Tenents:) But contrariwiſe, that he uſeth meer fraud, to inure the odious Term of Antinomiſm upon the choice and moſt pretious Doctrines of the Goſpel, delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and taught and defended by the moſt able and moſt faithfull Miniſters of Chriſt in all ages, to make both the pure Goſpel, and the defenders thereof, to ſtink in the noſtrills of unread and unwary men: ſubtlely concealing the names of thoſe worthies which have taught and maintained theſe truths, leſt their light and glory ſhould bring his Doctrines, contrary to theirs, into ſuſpition firſt, then to examination, and laſtly to an abhomination among men. How much more candour do we find in his fellowes the Ar-

Arminians, or Remonstrants? These in all their Tenents wherein they dissent from the Protestant Churches, do not load the contrary opinion with the imputation of Antinomism; but throughout their Apology, ever and anon ingeniously confesse of that which they hold, *Contra quod fere hactenus creditum est*, in these, and in words equipollent, acknowledging still their opinions to be wholly against the judgement of the best Churches and Divines before them. Master *Baxter* it seems hath more of the serpent in him than they had, therefore followes the steps of our English Arminians, rather than those in *Holland* before them. For as these blasted the sacred truths which they opposed with the name of Puritanism, so doth this man with the name of Antinomianism, to make them odious. A trick which the old Pharisees had learned of their Father, *Jo.* 8. 44. and propagated to their sonns the Papists, to besmear the Doctrines of Christ with the infamous titles of Schism, Nazarism, Heresie. Who then will lay it as a fault to their Children in our times, if they doe also *Patrizare.*

Secondly, that he hath the like fraudulent design in mingling with the truths of the Gospel, which he brandeth with Antinomism, the dreams of *Colyer*, *Spriggs*, *Hobson*, and other Ranters, (if indeed these be such, for I have not read them) giving the same brand to these as to the former; by this feat endeavouring to instill into the mindes of them that will be deceived,

1. That all the hereticall and blasphemous Doctrines which these men teach, are Antinomian.

2. That the truthes which the one side teach against Antichrist, and the Blasphemies which the other side vent against Christ, are of one Nature, and the former to be no lesse abhorred than the latter. Now if the Pamphlets of these men be so abhominable as Master *Baxter* affirmeth, and others also that are both able to judge, and faithfull to give their judgement, have told me; (for I acknowledge my self never to have been so ill at leisure to spend two hours in reading what any, or all of them have written) he dealeth unjustly to yoake them together with those tenents which he falsely accuseth of Antinomism, yea, with those that are rightly fathered upon Antinomians indeed. For granting that they hold some Tenents of the Antinomians, yet this neither argueth that all their heresies and blasphemies are so many peeces of Antinomism; Nor yet that the Antinomians speaking the same

things with these in the points proper to their sect, do also close with them in their abhominable Doctrines that are totally alien from the Antinomists Tenents. Else because Master *Baxter* joineth with the Jesuits in the Doctrine of Justification by works, we might conclude that in all points he is a Jesuit, holdeth not onely lies, equivocations, and mentall reservations; but also murthers, Massacres, Seditions, Powder treasons, and all other practices devised in hell it self, to be Meritorious works, if done to the advancing of *Romes* interest. And because he holdeth the very Act of believing to justifie, with the Socinians, therefore he is in all other the most blasphemous of their assertions against Christ and his blood, a Socinian also: or on the other side, that the Jesuits and Socinians are in all things, because in some things of the same judgement with Master *Baxter*. Were it the truth of Christ which Master *Baxter* goeth about to propagate, he would doubtlesse seek the propagation of it in Christs Spirit, and Christs way. When we see such serpentine windings and crookednesse in his disputes, who can but judge that it is the work of the Old Serpent about which he is imployed? Neither the truth of Christ, nor Christ which is the truth, have any such impotency in them, as to need any deceits and shifts for their support. When Mr. Baxter, yea when all the Jesuits have raised all their mists of Sophistry, Sycophancy contumely, *&c.* as thick as the smoke from the bottomlesse pit, to dim the beams of Gods grace shining forth in the Sunne of Righteousnesse; not one Raie thereof shall be thereby diminished, *it shall hide the* [pure light of the] *Gospell onely from them that perish, whose eies the God of this World hath blinded*. 2 Cor. 4.3,4. No one Soul shall be thereby beguiled, save those onely *that were made to be taken and destroyed*, 2 Pet. 2.12.

A large Catalogue more of the Antinomian Tenents are set forth by Master *Anthony Burgess*, affixed to his Lectures against them: Which he saith he hath gathered from *Luthers* works against them. I will not question his faithfullnesse in collecting them, whether *Isiebius* and his Disciples directly maintained such Doctrines; or whether *Luther* in prosecuting them, enumerates these as absurdities that would follow upon their Doctrine? whether they are imaginary, or reall opinions of any sect of men, the most of them are detestable. But I find not that either Master *Burgess*, or Mr. *Bax.* can name any one creature under the Sun, that hath declared by words or writing, that he held them. If they can,

we

we ſhall joyn with them, as diſſenters from, and excepters againſt every ſuch perſon. That theſe Antinomians of the former age were filthy dreamers, looſe livers, ſuch as turned the Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt into laſciviouſneſs, is very probable, if not certain, from that which *Calvin* and others have written againſt Antinomians and Libertines. And from ſuch we have no leſs abhorrence then Mr. *Baxter*.

But while Mr. *Baxter* declaimeth againſt the innocent, hee proclaimes himſelfe a rank Antinomian, in teaching, and maintaining that the perfect obedience and righteouſneſſe of the Law are not required, and conſequentially not due under the Goſpel. *Iſlebius* himſelf never ſpake ſo derogatorily to the righteouſneſs of the Law.

CHAP. XXIII.

Arg. *Mr.* Baxters *diſtinction of Juſtification in Title of Law, and in Sentence of Judgement examined, together with other diſtinctions equipollent to this. Whether beſides the preſent there be alſo a future Juſtification? and whether it be begun and perfected together at once.*

I ſhould wholly have paſſed over the 37, 38, 39, and 40 Theſes, with their Explications, as meerly ſhady imaginations, voyd of all reality and ſubſtance, without ſtopping to give them one word of anſwer: (For why ſhould wee talke of Pictures that have no life in them?) were it not that it is Maſter *Baxters* drift to carry us through theſe wayes of his own chalking, wholly from Chriſt, under a pretext of leading us to Chriſt the Juſtifier. To fruſtrate therefore his deceit I ſhall ſpeak ſomewhat to theſe paſſages of his Tractate alſo.

Theſ. 37. pag. 183.

B. *Juſtification is either in title, and the ſenſe of Law, or in ſentence of judgement: The firſt may be called Conſtitutive; the ſecond Declarative; the firſt Virtual, the ſecond Actual.*

Lawyers have layd it down for a Maxim, *Non est distinguendum ubi Lex non distinguit.* i. e. We are not to distinguith of any point in the Law, where the Law it self hath not made a distinction. If the Laws of men are not, much lesse are the Laws, and Word of God to be violated with mens bold distinctions: For this is no lesse then to bring Gods sacred Oracles into a subjection to mans vain fancies. Let Mr. *Baxter* shew any Scripture that gives footing for the distinguishing of Justification into that which is in title of Law, and that which is in sentence of judgement, into constitutive and declarative, or virtuall, and actuall Justification. These are the inventions of wanton wits in these latter times, whose endeavour it hath been to tear in peeces, and thereby wholly nullifie Gods Justification, and to put many Justifications of their own in stead thereof. We deny not a constitutive and declarative Justification in some sense, but in Mr. *Baxters* sense we deny it. It is granted that the Satisfaction which the Son by promise gave, and the Father accepted for the sins of the Elect, according to the Covenant between the Father and the Son, before more then once mentioned, did constitute the Elect justified in Christ before they were born; who notwithstanding were not declared just to their own consciences before they actually beleeved; nor to others until they manifested their Faith by their Works. But Mr. *Baxter* explodes this constitutive, and declarative Justification, as an unsufferable abhomination, and will not have his virtuality, and actuality to these applyed. And let him alleage any one Scripture that calls the sentence of life (unto those that shall bee saved by grace) that is to be pronounced in the last day, Justification: Or if he cannot, but that the justification of the New Covenant, wherever it be mentioned in the Word, be that which is in this present life, who sees not that his distinguishing here tends to the subverting of Scriptures, and of the both virtual, and actual Justification which the Scriptures speak of?

B. *The Scripture speaks of it many times as a future thing, and not yet done.* Rom. 3. 30. Mat. 12. 37. Rom. 2. 13. Explic. *pag.* 185.

This is all that he bringeth, or can bring for Justification in the

the day of Judgement; and this all is nothing. It followeth not because these Scriptures speak of Justification as of a thing to come, saying, they *shall be*, not they *are* justified; that this Future tense doth point out the day of Judgement. If I should say, Mr. *Baxter* shall dye, I should not be accused for speaking an untruth; but if any will needs confine that [*shall*] to the day of Judgement, that Mr. *Baxter* shall then dye, who would not laugh at the absurdity of the consequence? That of *Mat.* 12. 37. *By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned*; and that of *Rom.* 2.13. *Not the hearers, but the doers of the Law shall be justified*; speak of Justification after the tenor and covenant of the Law, not of Grace; therefore pertain nothing to the present purpose. Hee shall but *Dare verba*, damnably deceive with words, that teacheth men to seek for Justification by the righteousness of the Law consisting in deeds and words. Whosoever indeed shall neither in word or deed be found a transgressor of the Law actually or originally, shall be justified by his words and deeds. But this man must be sought for out of a happier generation then those of the race of *Adam*; else (if we except Christ alone) we must return our *Non est inventus*. That of *Rom.* 3. 30. speaks indeed in the Future tense, but may be as properly rendred, by the word [*will*] as [*shall*] (though the difference be not very considerable) thus, *It is one God which will* [or *shall*] *justifie the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through Faith.* The Apostle here meaneth no otherwise, speaking here in the Future, then what he had said before in the Present Tense of Justification. And it is as if he had said, God hath decreed and declared his method of justifying both Jews & Gentiles to be one and the same. As long as there remain, or succeed any upon earth of either part to be justified, the purpose of God abides firm to justifie as wel the one as the other by faith, and no one of either sort by Works; neither circumcision, nor uncircumcision shall avail, or hinder any thing, but Christ, faith in Christ shall bee all unto all in this businesse, as long as the world endureth. And what is there then in this Text to prove Mr. *Baxters* declarative Justification in the day of Judgement? Not that wee deny the adjudging of life in the day of Judgement to all that in this life were justified; but the Scriptures terming this last sentence by the name of Justification, whatsoever is said of Justification by Faith or Grace, is still to be understood

derstood in this life. And the whole reason that Mr. *Baxter* hath here to coyn a Justification in the day of judgement, is to lay a foundation of Popish Justification by Works; as by the sequele of this his Treatise will more fully appear. Else would we not contend with him about meer words, did they not tend to a destructive end; and that we are taught by him elswhere, *That no advantage is to be given to the Papists in the point of Justification.* To say that the last sentence of judgement shall declare to Men and Angels that the Elect were justified in this life by faith in him, is according to the voice of the Word. But to say that they shall be then fully Justified, as if their Justification had not been before compleated, is to out-throw the Bar two foot beyond the Papists for the maintenance of their self-justifying, and to speak more for them then they had wit, or gracelessnesse to speak for themselves.

Hence it is that in the beginning of his Explication, pag. 183. he forbears to mention other distinctions which are *common in others, and may be found in Mr.* Bradshaw, *Mr.* John Goodwin, *and* Alstedius, because (saith he) *they are not so necessary and pertinent to my purposed scope*, which is to destroy Justification by Grace, and erect in place thereof Justification by Works. It is a superlative praise that he giveth these men (how wel deserved by some of them I know not) that they are travelling another way from him, their faces are toward *Jerusalem*, and he cannot obtain a word of direction from them, but must trust to his own Compass to guide him to *Rome*.

What he hath more in the Explication, is but the interpretation of his own dream: And I have not superstition enough to keep me awaked, and attentive to dreams, and their interpretation.

Neither is there any thing else in his 38 Thesis, and its Explication, but a further forming of the same Chimæra, and notional Nothing, created out of his brain in the former Position, and its Explication. Or if there be any thing besides, it hath been examined in the precedent Chapter.

With no lesse silence might I also passe by the 39 Thesis, and its Explication, as being of the same nature with the former, saving that there are two things that wee may glance our consideration upon, before we passe further, lest that we should seem to look aside from any thing that hath an appearance of weight and

and strength in it to confirme his doctrine, of a Justification, or pardon of sin in sentence of Judgement, contradistinct from that which he maketh to consist in Title of Law. To make evident, that besides the Justification here, there shall bee another Justification in the day of Judgement, hee addeth these two things unto what he had before said.

1. An explication of the form of future Justification, and Pardon.

2. Another Text of Scripture, besides the former, to evince it. The former he hath in these words of that his Thesis, That it shall be an acquitting of the sinner at Gods publique Bar.

B. *From the accusation and condemnation of the Law pleaded against him by Satan. For* pag. 189. in the Explic. *the accusation of his guilt will be managed against him by Satan hereafter, from which accusation he shall be then acquitted.*

Who is there now that can doubt of a Justification after this life, when he hath heard so graphicall a description of it? But how came Satan and Mr. *Baxter* to be of so great acquaintance, that either shall know the others purpose about the Judgement to come? I had thought the Devill had made known onely to his friends, not to his adversaries, what he means to do to morrow, much lesse what hee meanes to doe in the day of Judgement. I should have conjectured that he is more taken up with the horror of torments that he shall suffer, then with the thought of further actings in that terrible day. Neither did I until now finde that Satan should be an accuser of others, having not what to say for the defence of himself, being accused by others, as the author of their sinne and misery in the day of Judgement. Neither can I find yet that the Scripture teacheth any such thing, that Mr. *Baxter* should be able to say, *he hath received from the Lord what he doth here discover to us.* It must be from some Apocrypha's, or out of the left side of the Romish Legend that hee hath borrowed this doctrine, where I shall leave him to dig out more traditions to maintain his bold assertions, that have no pillarage from Scripture to sustain them.

The latter, *vizt.* the Text of Scripture which he alleageth to the same end wee have in the beginning of the Explication thus,

B. *There*

B. *There is also a twofold pardon, as well as a twofold Justification, one in Law, the other in sentence of Judgement.* &c. Act. 3. 19. *Repent, that your sins may be blotted out when the time of Refreshing comes*, &c. *Lo here a Justification, or pardon of sin, in, or after our glorification begun.*

But Mr. *Baxter* knows that *Erasmus*, and the old translation otherwise render this Text, making the latter clause thereof Ecliptick, or unperfect, which is thus to be supplyed, *Repent* &c. *that your sins being blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come forth from the presence of God*, [What then? wee must supply] *Ye may have your part in the eternall refreshing and joy*: This rendring of the Text even the most solid Expositors that follow the other reprove not, but speak honourably of it; much more those that take it up. And if we so understand the Text, it hath no shew of affirming a forgiveness of sin, but glorification onely after the judgement day. Yea I have found none, until *Beza*'s new Translation of the Testament, that otherwise understood the text, or since this translation that hath reprehended the former as faulty, but all both before and since making that the sense of it. Yea the word ὅπως ἂν, which our Translation renders [*when*] both *Beza* and all the Orthodox Expositors render so ὑπεδὲν, *after*; thus reading the Text; [not *when*, but *after the times of refreshing shall come*. And this Mr. *Baxter* will not deny to be the proper meaning of the phrase. And will he notwithstanding say that the times of refreshing, that is, of everlasting joy, come first, and then the forgiveness of sinne follow? Mr. *Baxter* is not ignorant that the word [ἐλθωσι] in the original may be as properly rendred [*have*, or *are come*] as [*shall come*] And so many learned Translators and Expositors of this Text have understood it, *viz.* of Christs first coming in the flesh. And then without any supplement the Text is full in it selfe, and runneth thus; *Repent*, &c. *that your sins may be blotted out, seeing that the times of refreshing are come forth from the presence of God*. Let Mr. *Baxter* cite any one either Scripture, or Greek Writer in which [ὅπως ἂν] signifieth [*when*] otherwise I cannot see the least ground upon which hee can blame this, or uphold that Translation which he taketh up.

The translation which a learned and godly friend gives rendring

rendring the [ὅπως ἂν] [that] τελικῶς, *i. e.* to this end that, bears great force with me, as best agreeing with the constant use of the Scripture. And so the Text is thus to be read, Repent, *&c.* that your sins may be blotted out (and that the times of refreshing may come, *&c.* (upon you.) In this sense is ὅπως ἂν taken, *Mat.* 6. 5. *Lu.* 2. 35. *Act.* 15. 17. *Rom.* 34.

In which soever of all these senses the words be taken, this Scripture favours not at all Mr. *Bax.* neither hath his second justification or pardon in the day of judgement any patronage from it.

Yea the vanity of this distinction of pardon & justification, into that wch is in Title of Law, and that which is in sentence of judgement, this declarative, that constitutive, is evident to as many as understand evidences. For the whole tenor of scriptures which speakes of the last judgement, tendeth to manifest it to be a pronouncing of eternall glory to the Saints, because they were justified and before pardoned, perfectly righteous, in that sin was not imputed to them in this life, not a pronouncing of pardon to them that they may be thereby received into glory. Let there be any Scripture produced to evince the contrary. Or why will Master *Baxter* have the sentence of the judge and Saviour in the last day called a declarative justification and pardon? To whom shall this his sentence declare it? to God? He knoweth who are his, and whom he hath justified and pardoned in himself, and thorow Christ before the World was made, therefore needs no such declaration. To themselves? They had in this life the word of the Gospel declaring, the truth of Faith evidencing, and the spirit of grace witnessing it to them; and whether at the very instant they shall be affirmed to have come in spirit from the flames of Purgatory, or from under the Altar in Heaven to reassume their bodies (for Master *Baxter* keeps himself reserved in this treatise what he thinkes thereof) yet their separation from the reprobates hath enough declared them to be justified; so that they need not any further declaration to be made therein to themselves.

Or lastly to the World? This might be somewhat usefull to the World, and to themselves while they were in the World: but is now utterly useless, when they shall no more return to the World. Neither is there need of a voice to declare it to the World, where their instantaneous rapture up to Christ in the air; to sit with Christ in judging the World, shall fully enough demonstrate it.

And no more doth this Scripture uphold this Justification, as in other termes he proposed it, calling it Actuall, as distinct from that which he terms virtuall. All these are but windy notions, to fill up the dictionary of his distinctions which have no footing in the word. And when all these are fardled together, they will quickly be consumed with the fire of Gods jealousie, and little steed Master *Baxter* to dispute out his justification by works in the day of judgement.

No less vaporous is that which he hath, *Thes.* 40. and in its Explication, where he distinguisheth most learnedly between a barre, and the bar, between a *Wooden* and an *Iron* Bar, between a Bar, and a Bar of judgement, a *primary and secondary bar, a direct and a Consequential Bar,* and all with such sagacity and profoundnesse, as passeth all the wisedom of the Holy Ghost in the scriptures to make out unto us. *pa.* 190, 191, 192, 193.

B. *Thes.* 40. *When Scripture speaketh of Justification by Faith, it is to be understood primarily and directly of justification in Law title, and at the bar of Gods publick judgement, and but secondarily and consequentially of Justification at the bar of Gods secret judgement, or at the bar of Conscience, or* [*at the bar*] *of the World.*

And in the explication he disputeth about

B. *The* Forum Dei, *and the* Forum Conscientiæ, *the Bar of God, and the Bar of Conscience; the Bar of God, and the Bar of the World; the Bar of Gods secret judgement, and the Bar of his publick judgement; the Bar in heaven before the Angels, contradistinct, I suppose, to the Bar in hell before the Devills.*

At last he gallantly gathers together all these dispersed bars, justifying and unjustifying, pardoning and condemning us, in some sense at all the barrs, and in severall senses at severall barrs, according as his wit and Sophistry doth give him utterance.

And to what purpose is all this, but to tickle witty, wanton, and sophistically phantasticall brains, flattering them off from the simplicity, plainnesse, and soundnesse of the Gospell into a disputative, fangled, and wordy formality of religion, having the spirit and power of Conscience, and the word that should regulate it, enervate and evapored in to meer froth and bubbles, by this quaestionary

onary, distinctionary, and colorative shew of learning. In the mean while, all these barrs are by the subtlety of this Artificer made use of, to bar out the poor and simple for whom Christ hath dyed, from the due comfort of their justification, obscuring to them the Doctrine of grace, sending them from Bar to Bar for pardon and peace, and leaving them unsetled, and hovering to their very dying day, yea, till they come to the bar of Christ at the judgement day, where if they be followers of this mans Doctrine, they shall appear no lesse uncertainly and tremblingly before the great judge than the reprobate men and Devills. For untill then all the former barrs (according to Master *Baxter*) minister no absolute pardon or acquittance to any soul, so free from the Curse, but that we are left under the curse; acquit conditionally, that is, leave us fast bound to hell as it found us; loose the finger to day, that it may bind us up hand and foot to morrow. Such and so precious Gospel doth this learned Scribe draw out of his Treasury among his *Keder minsterians*, as by that we have already seen, hath been in part manifested; and by that which followes in this Treatise will more fully appear.

When contrary to all this Sophisticall winding, circling and labyrinthicall Mazes, the Scripture speaking of Justification and condemnation after the tenor of the Covenants, makes onely two Barrs of judgment, the Bar of justice according to the Law, and the Bar of grace or Mercy-seat, according to the Tenor of the Gospel or New Covenant: affirming all that are judged at the one condemned, and all at the other justified. That as soon as we are convicted of death, and vengeance onely due to us at the former, we are carried out in the Spirit of Christ thorow the consecrated way of his purifying blood, to seek remission of sinnes at the latter, the Throne of grace; the all gracious Father, from the bar of grace pronounceth to our consciences peace, and pardon, and joy which shall never be taken from us. This is the sole and all-sufficient Justification which the Scripture speakes of, speaking properly of justification. The subject hath heaped up Treasons against his Prince; For this cause the Law apprehends and arraigns him. The Princes Son pittieth and mediateth, and by Mediation obtaines a pardon from the Prince, and brings it under hand and seal, puts it into his hand for life, while standing at the Princes Law bar, he was by Law condemned, yea condemned himselfe. The pardon thus freely given, he cannot but gratefully embrace.

He queſtions not, none can queſtion that findes him guilty in Law, from what bar the pardon came. Hee was a dead man in Law. It muſt therefore needs be from free Grace, meer Mercy that the pardon came. The receiver acknowledges it, pleads onely the grace of the pardoner, not any righteouſneſſe of his facts, or innocency in the things whereof he is accuſed, or deſerts of former ſervice, or purpoſes of future loyalty, for his life. Such is the juſtification which the Goſpell holds forth. The multiplication of Barrs which Maſter *Baxter* maketh, at which his New Covenant juſtification is tranſacted; is a confection of fancied Beare, Bulls, and Bubbles, to diſtract poor Soules from the plain way, and ſound Comfort of Juſtification.

B. *Theſis* 41. pa. 194.

That ſaying of our Divines, [*that juſtification is perfected at firſt, and admits of no degrees*] *muſt be underſtood thus, That each of thoſe Acts which we call juſtification, are in their own kind perfect at once, and that our Righteouſneſſe is perfect, and admits of no degrees. But yet as the former Acts called, Juſtification, do not fully and in all reſpects, procure our freedom. ſo they may be ſaid to be imperfect, and but degrees to our full and perfect Juſtification at the laſt judgement.*

Here Maſter *Baxter* advanceth himſelfe not ſo much as Doctor and Moderator, as Popelike to command and impoſe a ſenſe, yea his ſenſe, upon that which the Divines in generall of all the Churches have ſaid, That ſaying [*that Iuſtification is perfected at firſt, and admits not of degrees*] *muſt be underſtood thus*: &c. very Magiſterially at the beſt; for what if not all of them, yea none of them meant ſo, would be ſo underſtood? This nothing hinders, though they will not, yet they muſt be thus underſtood. What neceſſity or authority lieth upon them and their writings, that they (will they, nill they) muſt be underſtod, or upon us, that although we know them to mean otherwiſe, yet we muſt ſo underſtand them? No other power or reaſon from Heaven or Earth is here ſpecified, beſides Maſter *Baxters placitum*, his pleaſure, he ſo defineth, ſo determineth. How fair doth he bid for *Peters* Chair, and Golden Pantofle?

Jupiter in cælis, Cæſar regit omnia terris.

What authority the Pope challengeth over all the Canonicall Scrip-

Scriptures, and the penmen thereof, the same doth Master *Baxter* over the Ecclesiasticall writings, and the Authors thereof. It is but one step higher to the Triple Crown. But *ipse dixit*, and we must be silent, else Master *Baxter* will be angry, and crown us with the fooles Cappe, and put upon us the *Ignoramus and Dul-man.*

Well, how must they then be understood? *viz.* that *each of those Acts* (saith he) *which We call Justification, are in their own kind perfect at once, and that our Righteousnesse is perfect, and admits not of degrees.*

Here I crave leave of the *Magister*, to put some few questions.

1. Whom hee meanes by the word [Wee] when he saith, which we call justification? doth he not mean Chiefly, yea onely himself? if not, let him name any of the Divines which deny against the Papists, the *Magis & minùs*, or degrees of Justification, but denies also against the same Papists, the twofold justification, and maintaines against their Sophisms, justification to be but one, one onely justification? I acknowledge my selfe not to be, that I am not ambitious to be *Librorum helluo*, I have in sacred Doctrines but one Master. Yet as many of our Divines as I have read, disclaim and detest this twofold justification, not onely as a Popish, but also as a new and Jesuiticall invention, devised for the perverting and subverting of that justification which is by grace. That this man therefore takes upon him to affix his *Index expurgatorius*, not to their words, but to their meaning; that they must be understood in another sense than they meant, because he will so have it, is not onely to usurp to himself a power above the Pope, but above God himself also, who doth not, cannot make that which was not to have beene the meaning of any man in what he hath said.

2. When he saith they must be thus understood, I demand what the necessity is, either simple and absolute, or respective and *secundum quid*? a *Necessitas præcepti*, or *Necessitas Medij*. If simple, and the duty injoyned by some precept, where is that precept of God or man to force the understanding to believe a lie? if respective, or in order to some end to which such a misunderstanding observeth as a mean; let us know what that end is, whether good or evill? if evill, we must not do or think one evill, understand wilfely against understanding and Conscience, for the promoting of another evill. This is worse than deviliſh, for he can say, *video*

Meliora,——Deteriora sequor. Or if good, their *damnation* [illegible] *just that report* (*saith the Apostle*) *we say,* [*much more that* [illegible] *would have us say*] *let us do evill that good may come thereof.* Ro. 3. 8. Or must Master *Baxters* will or peremptory conclusion [illegible] in stead of a Divine precept to necessitate and determinate our understandings to a false principle? Get thee behind us Satan, wee owne no such Masters.

3. When he saith, we must understand *Each of those Acts* [i. e. Gods justifying us first in title of Law, secondly in sentence or judgement] *are in their own kinde perfect* (not in the respect that either hath to other, but that the latter addeth a perfection which was wanting in the former) I might demand first, what besides the *Wee* in Master *Baxters* mouth hath called the latter Justification? But of this already. 2 What new thing, as an encrease or further degree of Justification, doth the latter Act adde to the former? He acknowledgeth that the former (which is the sole New Covenant Justification) doth acquit from Accusation and condemnation, *Thes.* 38. yea from all guilt and obligation to punishment, *pa.* 189. and all this *at once*, not by degrees, as in this *Thes.* 41. what new thing, or farther degree doth the latter feigned justification adde to this? Himselfe attributeth no more to this which he calls justification in Sentence of Judgement. This (saith he) acquitteth from Accusation and condemnation, *Thes.* 39. where now is the *Magis* here, or the *Minus* there? the most Eagle eye Lyncean eye cannot discern it in the substantialls, we must therefore seek it in the circumstantialls of justification. This he seems to place in two things.

1. The former only in *Title of Law*, the latter in *sentence or judgement at the bar.*

2. The former to be from the accusation and condemnation of the Law simply, the latter from the same accusation and condemnation *pleaded by Satan.* This is the whole difference which he putteth, as may be seen by comparing the 38, and 39 Theses together. To the first, I demand whether the Justification in this life be not an acquitting by sentence of judgement at the bar? Whether it be not a sentence of absolution pronounced to the soul and conscience of a sinner drawn to Gods bar, and there impleaded, and confessing it self guilty of sin, and of condemnation? Who was there ever of them whom Mr. *Baxter* vouchsafeth to call our Divines, that held otherwise? Who

en is the difference? Yes, saith Mr. *Baxter*, this latter is at the oblique bar. I answer, so is the former even that bar of God, at hich all that ever have been, are, or shall be justified, have, and ll have the sentence of Justification pronounced to them.

Object. But this latter shall be at the great and grand generall izes, before all the host of heaven, earth, and hell; whereas e former was but between God and the soul.

Sol. This is nothing else but a publick declaration to the orld, what God had before granted to the soul; which indeed judicatures of men, which are mutable, and deny oft in pubk what they had before acted in secret, may be of some conquence to him that is so publickly acquitted; but in respect of ods judgement, who cannot be inconsistent with himself, and hose acts in secret are as unreversible as those in publick, here nothing added to the bulk of justification, nor any thing (but e solemnity of the manifestation of it after the man is before mpleatly justified) to the circumstances thereof.

To the second I have spoken before, that Satans managing of e accusation and condemnation of the Law is more properly, not onely in this life, and let Mr. *Baxter* prove (if he can) any ch accusation that hee shall manage against us in the day of dgement: If he can prove it, the thing proved proves no addion or encrease which shall be then made to our present justifiation, because here also we are acquitted against all accusations leaded by Satan. If he prove it not, then there is in this respect *magis* in the circumstance of justification here, beyond that imanary justification in the day of judgement.

4. When he addeth, that we must understand our Divines afrming our Justification to be perfect at first, and to admit of no egrees, that they mean *our Righteousnesse is perfect, and admits not f degrees*, I demand which righteousnes himself meaneth? that hich he calls our Legal, or that which he calls our Evangelical ighteousnesse? or both? If the first, Christ made Righteousnes o us, this is indeed the righteousnes, the whole, and sole righteousnes, the Gospel righteousnes which we have given to us nto Justification, a righteousnes without us, which admits not f degrees: And this righteousnes is fully given us in this life, nd not reserved to be given us in the day of Judgement. This *must*] we are content Mr. *Baxter* should put upon our underandings, that in this sense we must understand our Divines. But this

this hews in peeces what Master *Baxter* addeth in this Thesis, making the Justification here *unperfect, and to have but degrees toward our full and perfect Justification at the last judgement*; for if so, the imperfection here, and the perfection there must be either in the rigteousnesse given (as I conceive) or in the act of giving the righteousnesse. Not the former, for Christ, whole Christ (according to Mr. *Baxter*) is the righteousnes given in this life. Neither will he, I suppose, affirme that we shall have a doubled Christ, or two Christs given us for righteousnes at the last judgement: Nor the latter; For I will not entertain so slanderous a thought of Mr. *Baxter*, to thinke he will say, that God gives Christ but unperfectly and seemingly here, but there perfectly, and really: Nay hee gives Christ perfectly and really here; There he will but own and manifest his former gift, and grant.

Object. But the former acts of Justification do not forthwith and *fully bring a total freedom*, and glorification after them, as doth this last at the last judgement.

Sol. This is not *ad idem*. Mr. *Baxter* here flirts from the question, which is of Justification it selfe, to the consequents, and effects of justification, which are total freedome from inherent sinne, and from all sorrow, glorification, and in truth also the sentence of life at the last judgement, which is not another justification, but the fruit and effect of our present justification. The supreme power of the Nation grants to Mr. *Baxter* great immunities, and a large demeans to be entred upon at the next general Assizes for the County, and withall appoints the Iudge of the Assizes openly to proclaim it. The Iudge doth according to his commission, and Mr. *Baxter* taketh possession, by the vertue of the aforesaid grant: will he say the former grant was unperfect in comparison of the Iudges proclamation at the Assizes, because it put him not into the present possession? are not as well the Iudges proclamation, as his entry, the effects of the former grant? But how far, and in what respects the possession of the effects of justification is suspended, hath been before examined. If he means that which he calls our Evangelical righteousnes, consisting in Faith, and Gospel obedience, Thes. 20. that we must understand *this righteousnes to be perfected at once, and not to admit of degrees*, this were totally to confute, and confound himself in what he hath written, and all the Papists his darlings in what they have written about the point of justification; and would put the lye upon

pon most passages that remain to be examined in these his Aphorisms. This therefore I cannot conjecture to be his meaning. would he could as wel discharge himself of doubleness as of llines,and simplicity.

In the 42 *Thesis* hee seemes to have had a purpose to have rought somewhat against that which they, whom he calls [*our ivines*] do assert of the perfecting of Justification at once, in he due and proper sense of their own meaning ; and to yeeld orth some shew of reason, that (contrary to their assertion) Justification begun admits of many steps and degrees one after another tending to the perfecting thereof. To this end he brings n a whole legend of stairs mounting up from the bottom to the op of Justification. A sack full of Heterogeneous bugbears,like hat army of *Solomon* whereof *Mahomet* speaks in his *Alcoran*, onsisting of men , beasts, angels, devils, creeping, flying, swimng, crawling, and hopping creatures, all marching together; n so comely and harmonious order as confusion and ataxie can evise: with such an army comes Master *Baxter* here against our Divines, with a catalogue of God and Christ justifying, Men ustifying, Angels justifying, self justifying, acts justifying,passions justifying, relations justifying, qualities justifying: One aking it from anothers hand , and each amending what the other had left defective ; so that at last the sinner so shifted from and to hand,after many hundreds, perhaps thousands of years, s at length fully justified ; or if he be a peece of knotty timber, erhaps comes not at last to bee fully justified. I shall leave the Reader to view the Aphorism in Mr. *Baxters* book ; I hold it not worthy the transcribing ; so it seems doth Mr. *Baxter* too ; for eviewing his company, of the whole number , which are no esse then tenne, he retaines onely two, *viz.* Justification in title of Law, and that in sentence of judgement , about which his former Thesis was occupant , disbanding all the rest, and so eaving the cause as raw and unconfirmed as he found it.

nu CHAP:

Chap. XXIV.

Whether Justification be, and remains to be conditional, and that to beleevers during life, and the justified, and pardoned may be unjustified, and unpardoned again? Also whether, and in what sense, and respects, there may be remission of sinnes before they be committed?

Thes. 43. pag. 196.

B. *The Justification which we have in Christs own justification is but conditional as to the particular offenders, and none can lay claim to it untill he have performed the conditions; nor shall any be personally justified till then. Even the Elect remain personally unjustified, for all their conditional justification in Christ, till they do beleeve.*

Thes. 44.

Men that are but thus conditionally pardoned, and justified, may be unpardoned and unjustified againe, for their non-performance of the conditions, and all the debt so forgiven be required at their hands. And all this without any change in God, or in his Laws. See Ball *of the Covenant, page* 240.

Thes. 45. pag. 198.

Yea in case the justified by Faith should cease beleeving, the Scripture would pronounce them unjust again, and yet without any change in God or Scripture, but onely in themselves: Because their Justification doth continue conditional as long as they live here. The Scripture doth justifie no man by name, but all beleevers as such. Therefore if they should cease to be beleevers, they would cease to be justified.

I joyn together these three Aphorismes, partly because Mr. *Baxter* doth very little sever them by the interposition of very short Explications, which might have been as well spared as used, for any light they give to his Aphorisms. But principally because they all treat upon one, and the same Argument, conditional Justification.

And

And here I could have deſired that he had treated more Argumentatively, and leſs Magiſterially. That hee had ſtated the queſtions which he here determines into Concluſions, and by the beſt Arguments he could, have aſſayed to prove his aſſertions, which he doth here nakedly, and peremptorily lay down only upon his own bare authority to be taken up, as if it were holy, and unerring. He could not have wanted help to have handled theſe points more controverſally, having the Papiſts on the one hand, and Arminians on the other, ſuggeſting matter, and arguments to him, it being their, not Chriſts cauſe and doctrine, which he bids, and teacheth here to ſtand alone; ſo that in caſe he had met with a learned adverſary that had driven him out of this field, he might have been ſure to have been ſuccourd with a whole brigade of theſe Sophiſters, that would either have laid in the place, or recovered the field for him again. But we muſt give leave to a man that is all wiſdome, ſometimes for his recreation to be ſervant to his will: And becauſe we find him not here what we expected, we muſt take him as he offers himſelf—— *Stet pro ratione voluntas.* Only I think it fit to ſave the labour to anſwer Arguments, when he refuſeth to make it his task to bring them: Bare negations of Concluſions being the beſt way of anſwering, where they are peremptorily, and fauouſly poſited, without any premiſſed reaſons from whence to draw them, or following arguments to back them. In matters of Faith aſſerted, not proved, *Jack Straws negation* being of equal validity to *John Scotus* his affirmation; onely we ſhall view his words, to ſee what ſhew of reaſon there may be found in them.

In the Explication of the firſt of theſe three Poſitions, *viz.* the 43. He tels us, *This needs not explication.* He ſaw it, and had acquaintance with it while it was yet but a notion in his brain, therefore needs not any ſpectacles to clear up unto him his own formed ofspring; but for my part, ſuch is my dulneſs, that whether I ſeek for his meaning in ſome part of the Poſition, or for truth in the reſt, I profeſſe my ſelf unable to underſtand without an interpreter. Let his words be not onely glanced over, but well conſidered, I might think there may be the like, though not ſo great an incapacity in anothers braine, as in mine.

The Juſtification (ſaith he) *which we have in Chriſts own Juſti-*

fication, is but conditional as to the particular offendors. Let the curious wit here inform my ſtupidneſs what he meanes by the Juſtification which wee have in Chriſts own Juſtification? What is Chriſts own juſtification? or what the juſtification which we have in Chriſts own juſtification? If we underſtand not what the ſubject of a propoſition is, we cannot judge at all of the truth of the propoſition, and do in vain enquire into the predicate. We can go no further underſtandingly in this Theſis untill wee underſtand this, of which all the reſt ſpeaketh. Chriſts own juſtification may be underſtood actively or paſſively: For the juſtification by which hee juſtifieth others, or that by which God hath juſtified him. If Mr. *Baxter* had meant the former, I conceive he would have ſaid plainly (as he doth every where elſe) *Juſtification*, without adding to it *Chriſts*, or *Chriſts own*, which ſeems to be uſed to diſtinguiſh here between the juſtification here ſpoken of, and the common juſtification whereof he treateth throughout this Tractate. If in the latter ſenſe, it may not ſuddenly appear, how poſſibly we can be juſtified in Chriſts own juſtification. Neither can Chriſts own juſtification properly taken, be poſsibly made our juſtification: For all will apprehend (without help) by Chriſts own juſtification, the juſtification proper to his perſon, which none had, or have in common with him. Yet I conceive Mr. *Baxter* means here Chriſts paſsive juſtification, Gods juſtifying of Chriſt; and that theſe words here do relate to the words which he hath within the 4 number of the foregoing, or 42 Theſis, where he ſaith [*4. His own Juſtification as the publick perſon at his reſurrection.*] which is not enough properly called Chriſts own, becauſe it is not the juſtification of Chriſt as perſonally alone, but as myſtically conſidered.

Taking this to be his meaning, I ſhall firſt ſpeak ſomething of the meaning of the phraſe, and then examine the truth of the Poſition. 1. For the meaning of the phraſe; As the firſt *Adam* ſuſtained the office of a publick perſon in relation to that Commandement of not eating of the fruit of the tree of Knowledge of good and evil, ſo that if he had obeyed we had all lived, and been juſtified in him; but in his diſobedience we all ſinned, and were condemned in him: So alſo Chriſt, the ſecond *Adam*, in making ſatisfaction to Gods juſtice upon the croſs ſuſtained the office of a publick perſon, ſtood in the room of all the Elect, bare their ſins as imputed to him, ſo that they all in him did their law, were in him crucified, dead, and buried, and ſuffered the paines of hell in

ſelf

ſelf. And as he was a publick perſon in his ſuffering, ſo alſo was he in his reſurrection; having paid the utmoſt farthing of our debt, he roſe to receive a full acquittance, or juſtification in his own, and our names for all the ſinnes for which, and all the vengeance which he had ſuffered for us, and we in him. The juſtification and acquittance then given him, and to us in his name by the Father, is that which (out of doubt) Mr. *Baxter* calls Chriſts own juſtification, yet was not his own ſo, but that it was every elect perſons in him.

Having the meaning of the phraſe, let us now enquire into the truth, or falſhood of the Poſition. *The Juſtification* (ſaith hee) *which we have in Chriſts own Juſtification, is but conditional as to the particular offenders, and none can lay claim to it till hee have performed the conditions, nor ſhall any be perſonally juſtified till then: Even the Elect,* &c. Hee ſaith much, and audaciouſly (as all may ſee) but how ſtrongly doth hee prove it? *For confirmation* (ſaith hee in the Explic.) *there is enough ſaid under the* 15, 18, 19, 20 *Poſitions before.*) And I anſwer, how valid and pertinent to his purpoſe that *Enough* which hee there ſaid is, I there examined: And becauſe he brings here no new reaſons, I may juſtly paſſe it by without giving any further anſwer.

Onely it ſhall not bee impertinent to take notice how ambiguouſly hee layes downe every clauſe of this Poſition, to corrupt with an evill ſenſe whom hee can, and to evade with the pretext of a good meaning where he cannot deceive, if eſpied, and queſtioned.

1. When he ſaith this Juſtification is conditional as to the particular offenders,& none can lay claim,&c. Though by the whole frame of this his Treatiſe, it is enough evident that he means what he ſpeaks in the worſt ſenſe; yet his words leave it here doubtful, whether he means that our Juſtification which we have in Chriſts juſtification be conditional, as Chriſt hath received it in his, or our names; or as he having received it for us, doth offer it to particular offendors upon conditions, upon the performance whereof they ſhall have it, with the fruit, and comfort thereof declared, and evidenced to their own ſoules. Though the former bee his ſenſe, yet knowing with what arguments hee may be encountred; That there was an abſolute, and not a conditional payment made, to which not a conditional, but an abſolute diſcharge is due.

That Christ as a publick person standing in our stead, received the same justification for himselfe and us, from all the sinnes that had been imputed both to him and us: but that he received for himself not a conditional, but an absolute Justification; therefore for us also. That if particular offendors be but conditionally justified in Christ, then are they not at all actually, and really justified in Christ, and so the fruit of Christs death being suspended, upon conditions, may be none at all, in case none performe the conditions. That it is against the stream of the Gospel, which affirms, that even *upon the cross he hath cancelled, or blotted out the hand-writing, spoiled the principalities and powers*, Col. 2. 14, 15. *redeemed us from the curse of the Law*, Gal. 3. 13. *purged the conscience from dead works, by his blood*, Heb. 9. 13, 14. *That God was in Christ reconciling the world* (while the world) *to himself*, 2 Cor. 5. 19. *and made us accepted in the beloved*, Eph. 1. 6. And all this before we had a being personally, therefore before we performed any conditions. Knowing (I say) how he might be overwhelmed with arguments from the Scriptures by our Divines, as hee hath read far more copiously then I have time here to particularize, in their works against the Papists and Arminians, and might have been more pressed and multiplyed against himself; and that Truth is not onely unconquerable, but victorious: To prevent the inconvenience, he leaves a hole by which to escape, *viz.* Hee meant not thus: But that our Justification is conditional as to our claim of right therein, we are not personally justified, have not our forgiveness declared, and evidenced to our own consciences till we perform the conditions. Such sincerity and integrity is there in Mr. *Baxters* doctrines.

2. When he saith, *None can lay claim to Justification untill he have performed the conditions, nor shall be personally justified till then*, he leaves it ambiguous whether he mean till his faith, obedience, and good works (which with him are the conditions) be in *fieri*, or else in *factum esse*, be begun, or else finished, and perfected, in doing, or else fully done. His phrase directly points out the latter, & the whole stream of his disputations in this Book concurs with it. Neither is Mr. *Baxter* such an *A, B, C, darian* that he need to be taught to speak Grammatically, and to deliver in proper termes his own dictates, that we should think him to speak more, or lesse then he meaneth, saving when he will doe so for his own advantage. Unlesse therefore he meant in the latter sense, and would be

be so understood, hee would give no advantage by his words to any so to understand him. This being then his meaning, he leaves us yet in doubt whether he joynes with the Papists here, in implying that it is possible to attain perfection of righteousnes, and so to have fully performed all obedience in this life, thereby meriting Justification, so winning it at the hardest, before he wear it, as we have found him in, and under his 23,24,26,27, Theses, maintaining enough fully behind the curtaine; or else with the Arminians, in holding that no man is justified in this life, and so confounding Justification and Glorification either with the other, an assertion worse then Popish, wholly contradicting the whole tenor of the Gospel, as *Rom.* 4.10. *Abraham was justified while yet uncircumcised.* Rom.5. *being* now *justified*, now *reconciled*, ver. 9,10. So *Rom.*8.30. *Eph.*1.7. Yea not to stay particularizing the whole sum of the Gospel, but because both Papists and Arminians are his cabinet friends, that he might please both, and offend neither, it sufficeth him to shew himself an adversary to the truth, wherein he hath them both confederates with him, and either with the other; it being no difficulty for him to close with both that differ but in words a little, but are one in substance, like *Sampsons Foxes hung together by the tails in a firebrand, though their faces look several waies.*

3. I might no less discover his subtilty in that ambiguous term of Personal Justification, as he opposeth it to Conditional Justification in Christ, how many senses it may bear, and scarce ever a good one; yet in the ambiguity of the phrase, a way left him to evade.

The 44 Thesis is ridiculous to all that desire to speak after the wisdome of God, and not after the fallacies of men that are meere foolishnesse with God. *Men that are but thus conditionally pardoned and justified, may be unpardoned and unjustified again,* &c. *ut supra.* In this at last Master *Baxter* is not to be deprived of his due praise; that he makes his foundation and building to consist of homogeneous Materialls: an imaginary foundation, and a phantasticall building. It is as much as if he had said, A fancied something made up of nothing, may without the spilling of much blood or sweat, be resolved into nothing again. The Cat in the Fable, which *Venus* turned into a fair Virgin, because she would not leave to hunt mice, was quickly reformed into a Cat again. If one dream make Master *Baxter* a Holy Pope, the next dreame

dream may unpope and unhallow him again. And men that were but conditionally justified, may be unjustified again, and be altogether as well justified while unjustified, as when conditionally justified, and as fully pardoned while unpardoned, as when conditionally pardoned; and all the debt as fully required at their hands when it is conditionally forgiven, as when it is unforgiven again. *And all this without any change in God, or in his lawes.* For all these are not Gods, but Master *Baxters*, and his Arminians, and Jesuits justifications, and Non-Justifications pardonings and unpardonings, forgiving debts and requiring them again. *God is unchangable, His gifts and calling without Repentance.* Rom. 11.29. But these are *Protei and Chamelions*, (specially when the change is from evill to worse) and would feign to themselves and us a God like to themselves, that should be a changeable God, no God.

It behoved Master *Baxter* to have proved from Scriptures this Popish Arminian Doctrine of conditionall justifying, and unjustifying, *&c.* from the word, that it might appear to us that the Oracles of God, and not the Sophistry of men had drawn him into this Topsie turnie tattle, rather than Doctrine of justification. Not doing this, his breath smells of a Pope in his belly; That his aim is to make the word of God to strike saile to the Sophisms of the Papists and Arminians, and not these to the word. For so he proceeds in the next, which is the 45 Thesis in their language.

> B. *Yea in Case the justified by faith should cease believing, the Scripture would pronounce them unjust again,* &c. *because their Justification doth continue conditionall as long as they live here,* &c. *if they should cease to be believers, they would cease to be justified.*

If the Heavens fall, we shall need no hobbies to catch larkes. If Master *Baxter* cease to be a man, he will cease to be an Impostour. They are suppositions of things possible, or impossible, which in both these his Theses he maketh: if of possibles, why doth he not prove them? if of impossibles, what can be aim at but the deceiving of them that are made to be taken, and the destroying of the peace of tender and infirme consciences? Hee turnes us over in the former position to *Ball* of the Covenant. I have it not. But if once he be the same *Ball* with *Ball* of Faith, there is no more accordment betweene *Ball* and *Bax.* than betwixt Christ and *Belial.* I heard indeed long since, that this Master *Ball* seeing

ſeeing faſhionableneſſe and formality tending ſomewhat to the Popiſh Outſideneſſe in Religion was the way to preferment, had before his death ſomewhat declined. But unleſſe I ſaw grounds for ſuch a thought I cannot entertain it, ſo great an eſtimation both of his ableneſſe and holineſſe hath his Treatiſe of Faith left in me. But if otherwiſe, it is not unnaturall to a *Ball* to roll, eſpecially down the hill. And we halt not between two opinions, we have the Lord, and not *Baal* for our God.

But Maſter *Baxter* cannot put upon us this bull, that he ſhould with a trick of the hand beguile us into an opinion, that in this Doctrine he is a follower of *Baal*. Nay firſt his popiſh Schoolmen and Jeſuits have taught him, and then *Arminius*, and his followers have poliſhed him; ſo that in theſe two Theſes he doth but ſpeak parat-like, even word for word after theſe his Maſters; as I could (if there were need) alleadge out of the Authors whom he followeth. Yea further, the more antient Schoolmen, and the moſt learned and Metaphyſicall among the Jeſuits, blow off as baſely derogatory from the perfection of Gods Nature, the frothy poſitions which he here layeth down as Articles of Faith, which he doth not at all apply himſelfe to prove, as if they were unqueſtionable becauſe his quill hath dropt them.

He ſees his Doctrine in theſe 2 Theſes, ſuch as either hath nothing but words in it, or if any thing reall, ſuch as tendeth to the advancing of the Popiſh and Arminian Doctrines of Univerſall Redemption, Freewill, falling from Grace, *&c.* Therefore intreats his reader [in the Explication] to ſuſpend his judgement till another Tractate of his about univerſall Redemption come forth, which in the Poſtſcript to theſe Aphoriſms he tels us he is not certain whether it will be ever; and in his Append. pag. 164. ſeems to conclude that it will be never: And that, if I miſtake not, is upon Saint Juſtifications day, according to the *Baxterian* account. And in caſe it bring no better ſavour of Chriſt with it then this his Tractate, better then, then ſooner. To which time alſo if he had ſuſpended the publication of this book, I doubt not he might have obtained more then a conditional Juſtification from the guilt of ſuch a ſuſpenſion.

And *For that which intimates the falling away of the juſtified*, (ſaith he) *he ſpeaks onely upon ſuppoſition*, &c. *but doth beleeve that the juſtified by Faith never do, nor ſhall fall away.* ibid. Explic. A larger profeſſion in reſpect to this Article of his Creed, then I

expected from him, if it be single and hath no flaw of rottennesse and deceit in it. But when we have found him calling the sentence of judgement in the last day, justification by Faith, as well as that which is in this life in title of Law, (as he terms it) pag. 185. and makes the justification in this life to be meerly conditional, and consequently either nul or reversible, in these 44, & 45 Thes. what can we think can be his meaning, when he saith, *I beleeve that the justified by faith never do, or shall fall away*; but this, that they that are sentenced once to life in the day of judgement, and already glorified, neither doe, nor shall fall away. And yet for him that holds our justification to be stil but conditional untill the day of judgement, it would (I think) be a harder task to prove that it remains not conditional after the day of judgement, then for the truly Orthodox in this point to prove it to be in this life absolute and unconditional. Were I the man that were fit to undertake such a dispute, I should (as I conceive) have a great advantage against such an adversary; for most of the arguments which he should bring to prove the absoluteness and immutability of justification in the Kingdom of glory, would strengthen against himself the same absoluteness and immutability of justification in the Kingdome of grace. And almost all that he should be able to answer for the eluding of my arguments against absolute justification above, would strengthen me to answer his arguments against absolute justification here. But I hold it altogether unproper to make so holy a thing the subject of ludicrous exercitations. The Scripture is as full to prove the Saints perseverance in grace here, as their perseverance in glory above, and as possible is the falling from the latter as from the former.

Now before I wholly pass from these positions of Mr. *Baxter*, to make way for the examination of other Positions of his which I shall annex to these in this Chapter, because of the neer affinity of their matter with that which is contained in these: I shall speak something in opposition to Mr. *Baxters* universall conditional Justification in Christ, or (as Mr. *Baxter* termes it) in Christs own Justification.

First then, whatsoever sins, of whatsoever persons were imputed unto Christ, and for which he hath made full satisfaction to Gods Justice, these are no more imputed, but for ever remitted in Christ absolutely, and unconditionally to them who were

were the committers thereof. But all the sinnes of all the elect, and of them onely, and not of the world, were imputed to Christ, and hee hath made full satisfaction, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.* The proposition is clear, unless we will pronounce God unjust: For if he should impute to the offender any one sin which was imputed to Christ, and for which Christ hath fully satisfied Gods Justice, then should God bee unjust in taking vengeance twice of the same sin, once from Christ, and another time from the offender, contrary to the both equity of his justice, and infallibility of his truth, in either of which it is unpossible for God to fail. Or if any should say that their sins were but conditionally imputed to Christ, and that he made but a conditional satisfaction for them, this were totally to deny the truth, and reality of Christs sufferings. It was not a conditional, but absolute, and real satisfaction that he made to divine Justice; they were real stripes, real and absolute wounds, groans, torments, death-pangs, by which he satisfied Justice: He was not conditionally, but verily *made sin for us*, 2 Cor. 5. 21. *a Curse for us*, Gal. 3. 13. *himself bare our sins in his own body on the tree*, 1 Pet. 2. 24. *was wounded for our transgression, bruised for our iniquity*, Isa. 53. 5. When all this was done absolutely, and really, and so a real, and absolute condition made, shall all this produce only a conditional, and not a real and absolute justification in Christ to, and for them who in him have made absolute satisfaction, so that themselves in themselves must make absolute satisfaction again? This possibly may agree with Mr. *Baxters* Justice, but never with the Justice of God. The assumption is thus proved, as to his bearing, and satisfying for the sins of the Elect only, and not of the world. He suffered not for such as we call *Individua vaga*, certain uncertain persons, himself not knowing who they were, or should be. *The High Priest, that typifyed him*, offered not his sacrifices at adventures for he knew not whom, *but bare the names of them for whom he offered, before the Lord*, Exo. 28. 9, 10, 11, 12, 29. And this was to be fulfilled in Christ their Antitype. *I lay down my life for the sheep*, saith he, *and know my sheep*. Joh. 10. 11, 14, 15. *For the sheep onely, for them whom he knew to be his sheep*, he layd downe his life. And lest any should think hee speakes here onely of his called, and not his elect ones, he addeth, *Other sheep also I have which are not of this fold*, i.e. of Israel; but of the Gentiles, *them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice. They are his sheep,*

and he layeth down his life for them, to satisfie for their sins before they were beleeving, before they were in being, and brings them home by the voice of his Gospel afterward, ver. 16. But to the unbeleeving Jews he saith, *Ye beleeve not, because ye are not of my sheep*, ver. 26. *First sheep* purged, and redeemed by the blood of the Shepheard, and then beleevers afterward. And if not sheep first, then unbeleevers for ever. Neither saith he, ye are not my sheep justified and reconciled by my death, because ye beleeve not; but *ye beleeve not because ye are not of my sheep, in the number of my Elect and justified ones.* Justification, absolute justification in Christ, still goeth before faith in the so justified. Again for them all, and onely, did Christ as our Priest offer himself in sacrifice, for whom as our Priest he offered prayers to God when the offering of himselfe was at hand; but he so offered his prayers, *not for the world, but for them which God had given him*, i. e. the elect, Joh. 17. 9. So in this part the Assumption stands firme; on the other part, that he bare and satisfied for all the sinnes of all the Elect, is plain; *The blood of Christ purgeth from all sinne*, 1 John 1. 7. *by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified*, Heb. 10. 14. When it is said they are perfected for ever, it is included that there remaines not one sinne unsatisfied for. And this is the priviledge of all the Elect, of all the Sheep both in being, and in futurition, both within, and without the fold, as before was manifested.

2. If Christ hath purchased, and we receive in this life onely an universall conditionall Justification: It will follow also that God hath in himself decreed before all time onely such a justification to men; and consequently that he neither loved, nor elected to life them that are saved more then the damned: For the *Son was in the bosom of the Father*, therefore privy to his secret will, to his very bosom counsels, *came down from heaven not to transgresse, but to fulfill his will*, Joh. 6. 38. & 4. 34. & 5. 30. *was faithfull to him that appointed him*, &c. Heb. 3. 2, 6. So that he acted in time according to the will and decree of God before all time. But it is false that God decreed onely such an universall conditionall justification to all, not preferring in his love and election those that shall be saved before them which shall be damned, as appeareth *Act.* 13. 48. *Rom* 8. 30. & 9. 15--to the 25. *Eph.* 1. 4, 5, 6, 7. Therefore it is false also that Christ hath purchased onely, and we receive onely an universal conditional Justification.

3. Upon

3. Upon as good grounds as Mr. *Baxter* doth in the ensuing part of this Treatise argue from salvation or glorification to justification, might I also argue from justification to salvation, that if justification be universally conditionall, so is salvation or glorification also; that if one, then both run upon these terms *dum bene se gesserit*, if he beleeve and obey he shall be justifyed and glorisyed, if not, neither shall be his portion. And when any is justifyed and glorifyed, his perseverance in that state depends upon his freewill, runs upon the same condition still, so long justifyed and glorifyed as he is willing and obedient, if he cease to obey he shall be unjustifyed and unglorifyed again. And thus all the fruits of Christs death shall be rolled to nothing, and Christ righteousnesse and glory shall be a conditionall and mutable righteousnesse and glory, to day in splendor, to morrow in darknesse, and himself become a conditionall Saviour, a conditionall King, at one time compleat and sitting among his golden Candlesticks, in the midst of his glorious Temple; at another unchristed, unkinged; a head without a body and members, a Saviour of nobodies, a King without subjects; some not at all submitting to his golden scepter, the rest that have submitted revolting from him, some from the kingdome of grace, some from the kingdome of glory, as *Adam* from Paradise, the Angels from heaven, so that he shall be left alone, and his sufferings and merits lose all their fruit by means of this conditionall justification: There is I confesse no weight in this Argument as to the truly Orthodox. But it holds as firme to Mr. *Baxter* as his Arguments can hold to us about conditionall justification in Christs justification.

If he object, that the Saints in the kingdome of glory shall be so confirmed that they shall not fall away.

I shall answer, so are the Saints also in the kingdome of grace, and are as absolutely fixed therein, upon the truth, love and power of God in Christ, as the triumphant Saints in the kingdome of glory. I doubt not to prove the one as soundly as he can prove the other.

I cease further to enlarge my self in Arguments to this purpose. That which I have said being (as I before mentioned) spoken, not so much to prove an absolute, and to shew the vanity of a conditionall justification by Christ, as to make way to that which comes after to be handled.

From the 45 then I paſſe to the 55 *Theſis* of Mr. *Baxter*, becauſe whatſoever there is in the interpoſed poſitions worthy of examination, either hath been or will come to be conſidered in a place more convenient. Only by the way we ſhall take a ſhort view of what he hath in and under the 54 *Theſis*; it runnes thus, *pag.* 209.

B. *Remiſſion, Juſtification and Reconciliation, do but reſtore the offender into the ſame ſtate of freedome and favour that he fell from, but adoption and marriage union with Chriſt, do advance him far higher.*

Here Mr. *Baxter* gives me occaſion to put up ſome Quæries to him.

1. Whether remiſſion, juſtification and reconciliation are equipollent termes ſignifying one and the ſame thing in ſubſtance, or ſo many diſtinct things differing each from other as well in ſenſe as in ſound? If differing things, wherein doth the difference conſiſt? he anſwers in the explication,

B. *The freedome from obligation to puniſhment is called Remiſſion; the freedome from accuſation and condemnation is called Juſtification; and the freedome from enmity and diſpleaſure is called Reconciliation.*

Theſe are all at once, but he ſaith, not [*all one.*]

Excellently diſtinguiſhed, as he that divided the word [malt] into four parts. But doth not every of theſe words imply all thoſe freedomes? doth not remiſſion free as well from accuſation, condemnation and enmity, as from obligation to puniſhment? And doth not reconciliation free from obligation to puniſhment and from condemnation as well as from enmity and diſpleaſure? And doth not juſtification likewiſe do all as well as one? I know no abſurdity to aſſert that the ſame freedome is in divers reſpects, but in the ſame ſenſe (as *Ameſius* well expreſſeth) called by all theſe names. As the ſtate of ſin from which we are freed, is conſidered as a ſtate of ſubjection to puniſhment or vengeance, ſo this freedome is called Remiſſion. As the ſame ſtate is conſidered as ennity againſt God, ſo is it called Reconciliation. As the ſame ſtate is conſidered as a ſtate of ſin and condemnation, ſo the ſame freedome from it is called Juſtification; and this alſo ſo, that juſtification is all theſe, remiſſion all, and reconciliation all, and neither any thing effectually if it be not all. All togeather make up one act of God by his Goſpell, and may (as I conceive more properly be called Gods act or acts [in their active ſenſe] then

Ameſ. Med. lib. 1. cap. 27. §. 22.

then concomitant conſequents of one and the ſame act of God. Beſides if he take them for three differing things, I would aske him whether there be any myſterie in the order wherein he placeth them? Whether firſt we have remiſſion of ſins, then juſtification from condemnation, and then at laſt reconciliation? I ſpeak of priority and poſteriority in order, not in time, for ſo he ſaith they are concomitants and at once. If ſome ſuch myſtery, I would be enformed, whether by reconciliation he mean the reconciling of our love to God, or of Gods love to us? if the former, how can our love (as he teacheth) be a condition of juſtification, if in order it be not before but after juſtification? if the latter, then it ſeems Gods love is not the cauſe of our juſtification (ſeeing it doth in order follow it) but that our love to God is the cauſe and ground of it.

Or if he put theſe three as *Synonyma's* for one and the ſame thing, why doth he then ſo curiouſly diſtinguiſh; and (as it were) give to them, their ſeverall differencing forms, as we find him to do?

2 Whether he take them for the ſame or divers things, I enquire whether they be antecedents or conſequents of our union with Chriſt? If antecedents, whether it be poſſible for a man to be juſtifyed in the way of the new Covenant (for of this juſtification Mr. *Baxter* ſpeaketh) being yet out of Chriſt? or how is he then juſtifyed by faith, charity, and good works; except it be by a legall faith, charity and works? and if legall, how are theſe then our Goſpell righteouſneſſe? or have they Goſpell righteouſneſſe which are not in Chriſt? Or if conſequents of our union with Chriſt, whether then they do not preſuppoſe our union with Chriſt? and if ſo, whether the juſtifyed in Chriſt are not advanced to a far higher ſtate of freedome and honour by their being found righteous in Chriſt, then they loſt by being found ſinners in *Adam*, and whether their union with Chriſt be not the common foundation both of juſtification and adoption? Or laſtly is his meaning, that *our union with Chriſt is the foundation not only of remiſſion, juſtification and reconciliation, which do reſtore the offender into the ſame ſtate of freedome and favor which we had loſt, and faln from: but alſo of Adoption and of a far higher advancement then that from which he fell?* herein I ſhall not diſſent from him. But why then doth he ſo tranſpoſe his words as to make the ſtream of Gods operations to run backward, if not to make mans qualifi-

fications the ground of his union with Christ, his faith and good works by which he is justifyed to be if not the cause, yet the antecedent of this union, and not this union to be the cause or antecedent of his both justification and holinesse? So much I thought fit to interpose here, that this *Thesis* of Mr. *Baxter* might not serve as a bridge to carry over the reader captive unto some fallacious untruths in the after-part of this his Tractate contained Hence now let us passe to the 55 *Thesis*, which hath not a totall disagreement with the former that have been examined in this Chapter, but a dependence upon them.

B. Thesis 55. p. 211.

Before it be committed it is no sin, and where there is no sin the penalty is not due, and where it is not due, it cannot properly be forgiven; therefore sin is not forgiven before it be committed, though the grounds of certain remission be laid before.

The strength and evidence of this reasoning will the better appear if we lay by it another to the same tune and upon the same terms. It cannot be denyed to be as good an argumentation as this, if I should thus argue. *Before it be committed it is no sin, and where there is no sin, there is no penalty due, and where it is not due, it cannot properly be required; therefore the sins that have been committed since the death of Christ, had not their penalty born by Christ, before they were committed, and consequently, Gods justice remains unsatisfyed for the sins of all, that have been committed since the death of Christ, and every offender is to bear the condemnation of them in his own bosome, though the grounds of certain remission were laid before* [in God] *except another Christ be sent from heaven to bear, or the same Christ again to bear the penalty of the sins after they are committed.* Whether this argumentation doth not carry in it as great, if not greater, likelihood of reason then Mr. *Baxter*, I leave to every rationall man to judge. And thus when a proud lust possesseth us to reason from our own brain and not from Gods word, we easily reason our selves into hell.

Neither do I see how Mr. *Baxter* according to this reasoning can ever look to be justifyed or saved, except by one of these two wayes, either by asserting his own righteousnesse (which hitherto with his fellowes) he hath made but a collaterall with the righteousnesse of Christ to justifie and save) to be at a pinch all-sufficient and effectuall to perfect the work without Christ; as it is with partners in a Trade, and buying and selling of wares, what one doth both do, and what bargain one makes both must

stand

ſtand to it: Or elſe by canonizing the Popiſh maſſe, to offer therein Chriſt often unto God as a ſacrifice for the expiation and forgiveneſſe of his ſins when he hath committed them, ſith Chriſts offering himſelf was in no wiſe the bearing of the penalty, or ſatisfying of Gods juſtice, for his or our ſins, becauſe not then committed.

But let us ſee whether in any ſenſe the reaſoning of Mr. *Baxter* here, may be made good or taken up as tolerable. Not to mention here Gods forgiving of ſins as an act immanent in God from eternity. For this would but make Mr. *Baxter* ſtartle, he is no more patient to hear this voice, then was *Caligula* at the voice of Thunder; his bloud riſeth at it, as do theirs at the ſight of a Cat whoſe natures have an antipathy to that poor creature that never meant them hurt: Let us conſider forgiveneſſe and pardon in tearms and wayes as himſelf granteth a poſſibility of giving and receiving it. And

Firſt, *in foro conſcientiæ* at the bar of God in the conſcience of man, to which he moſt limiteth and contracteth remiſſion and juſtification. May not the offender apprehend and apply to himſelf the pardon of his future (as well as of his paſt and preſent) ſins through the Lord Chriſt in ſome ſenſe?

1. In reſpect of the ſeed of all the ſins which he ſhall through infirmity commit in the time to come of his life, I mean his corrupt nature or originall defilement and ſin, from which as from their naturall ſource, all their acts of ſin ſpring, every true beleever is, and may apprehend himſelf pardoned; this the very Papiſts acknowledge, denying originall ſin and defectiveneſſe to have any mortality of ſin in it, becauſe the guilt thereof is purged from the ſoul by the bloud of Chriſt at his very firſt admiſſion and entrance into Chriſt, (as they ſay) In this reſpect I doubt not but Mr. *Baxter* will confeſſe that all their after acts of ſin are remitted (in their ſeed and womb) to beleevers before they be committed.

2. In reſpect of Gods not imputing them to the perſon that ſhall offend, ſo the ſins not yet committed are forgiven to every elect perſon. God hath laid on Chriſts ſcore all the ſins of the elect, committed or to be committed, and ſatisfyed his juſtice for them upon Chriſt, who in their names hath paid the penalty of all, therefore their conſciences are diſcharged, neither ſins paſt nor ſins to come ſhall be any more imputed to them. *There is*

no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Jeſus, Rom. 8. 1. There is dayly new ſinning, why not alſo ſubjection to condemnation? becauſe the perſon being in Chriſt, though ſubject to a neceſſity of ſinning, yet through the juſtification of his perſon is exempted from the further imputation of ſin ſo committed unto condemnation; *He that beleeveth hath everlaſting life, and ſhall not come into condemnation, Joh.* 5. 24. He comes dayly into the acting of new ſins; how is it that he comes not into a ſubjection and obligation to condemnation by thoſe ſins, but becauſe they were forgiven to the offender before, therefore not imputed to him when committed? It is one chief priviledge of the new Covenant, *Their ſins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remiſſion of theſe is, there is no more offering for ſin? Jer.* 31. 38. &c. *Heb.* 10. 17, 18. ſpeaks the holy Ghoſt here only of ſin paſt and not of thoſe to come, that they which are within the new Covenant, have remiſſion of them? then

1. The ſame perſon hath ſome ſins forgiven and ſome not forgiven by Chriſt, that which is paſt is remitted, that which is to come is retained.

2. Then the priviledge is no priviledge, if only ſins paſt are not remembred, but ſins to come are kept in Gods memory to impute them every moment as faſt as they are committed: For one of theſe laſt milſtones tyed to the neck of the poor offender, ſinks him into hell as ſurely as if all that are removed had their weight returned upon him with that one to ſink him.

3. If God hath remitted and juſtifyed a beleever from the ſins which he hath committed, and not from the ſins which he foreknoweth they will commit, but imputeth or will impute them, then is the ſame perſon both juſtifyed and unjuſtifyed at the ſame time, and God at the ſame time both loveth the ſame perſon to eternall life, and hateth him to eternall condemnation: which were no leſſe abſurdity then to attribute two contrary wils acting in God at once, and ſo the ſame perſon be declared in his own conſcience at the ſame time both in the ſtate of life, and in the ſtate of death; of life, in reſpect of the ſins paſt forgiven through Chriſt; of death, in regard of the ſins to come not yet forgiven.

Secondly, In Chriſt, or (as Mr. *Baxter* terms it *Theſis* 43.) in Chriſts own juſtification, either all ſins are forgiven to the elect or none at all. When having done their Law, and paid their debt,

debt, Christ appeared in the *most holy place*, in the heaven at *Gods mercy seat to mediate* with his bloud for them, he either received acquitance from, and forgiveneſſe of all the ſins which his elect in after times ſhould commit, and ſo in Chriſt their ſins to come were forgiven, or elſe no ſin was forgiven; for as yet they were not in being, therefore neither were their ſins yet committed. But he received then in their names a full acquitance and forgiveneſſe of their ſins as hath been before ſhewed, therefore of their ſins before they were committed, and they were forgiven before they had offended. Hence ſome of our Divines thus reaſon, if ſince Chriſts ſatisfaction any ſins be imputed any more to the elect, they muſt be ſuch as Chriſt hath or hath not expiated with his bloud, and made ſatisfaction for to Gods juſtice; if ſuch as Chriſt hath expiated, then notwithſtanding that God imputes the ſin, yet the perſon to whom he imputes it is in grace and favour with God, and the full penalty of his ſin (while imputed) is paid to God: but this were injuſtice not incident to God to impute a debt which is fully paid him. If ſuch as Chriſt hath not ſatisfyed for, then the faith of an elect perſon obtains at Gods hands forgiveneſſe, or the not imputing of ſuch ſins, for which Chriſt hath not ſatisfyed Gods juſtice, and ſo there ſhall be here remiſſion without the ſhedding of bloud, and juſtification out of Chriſt; or faith and Goſpell obedience ſhall be the price and ranſome of their ſoules: All which is moſt abſurd. Therefore, the ſins of the elect yet uncommitted, are in Chriſt as fully forgiven, as thoſe that are already committed.

Thirdly, If Mr. *Baxters* meaning be when he ſaith [the ſin is not forgiven before it be committed] that the beleever hath not a ſingular apprehenſion of the forgiveneſſe of every ſingular ſin before it be committed, and that God hath not declared to his conſcience the forgiveneſſe of every ſingular offence, *i.e.* this evill which at this, and that evill which in that hour of his life he ſhall drop into: I acknowledge in this ſenſe neither are any of our ſins future forgiven, nor many of our ſins paſt. For who in this caſe knoweth (not only how oft he ſhall erre, but alſo how oft and wherein he hath erred? in this reſpect the generall pardon ſealed in Chriſt bloud to us, though it mention not every ſingular errour of our lives contained under the generall, is ſufficient for us.

But

But perhaps Mr. *Baxters* meaning is, that Chriſt hath not purchaſed to the elect a plenary and abſolute forgiveneſſe, but hath conditionally dyed for all if they ſhall beleeve and obey, and upon this condition runs the hope of pardon as to the ſins which they ſhall commit unto their lives end; their renewed ſins being dayly pardoned upon the continuance and dayly renewing of their obedience, and ſo this *Theſis* runs in the ſame channell with the 43, 44, & 45. Poſitions, and for this cauſe I have annexed it to them; Neither do I ſpeak any thing to this Poſition in this ſenſe here, becauſe it is prevented by what hath been already ſaid in the examination of what he hath ſaid there. And too much hath been ſaid both to thoſe and this Poſition in which nothing but Magiſteriall aſſertions without proofs are to be found.

Chap. XXIV.

Arg. Mr. Baxters *new Model of the cauſes of Juſtification examined; and firſt his diſpute about the efficients, and the materiall and formall cauſes thereof.*

MR. *Baxter* in his 56. *Theſis* diſputeth very Logically, though but little Theologically, of the cauſes of juſtification, and becauſe he thinks them all *Athenians* whom he hath a luſt to corrupt, *viz.* ſuch as *ſpend their time in nothing elſe but in telling or hearing ſome new thing*, *Act.* 17. 21. therefore looking aſide from that which all the ſoundeſt, *i. e.* (with him) the Antinomian Divines have ſaid upon this Argument, and diſdaining it with a ſquint eye as too ruſtick, and not enough pretty and dialecticall; himſelf preſents me with a new caſe and order of cauſes from the forge of his fancie, *viz.* ſome ſole and ſome ſociall, ſome ſingle and ſome double, ſome proper and ſome improper cauſes, ſome cauſes that are cauſes, and ſome cauſes that are no cauſes; without further particularizing take him thus in his own words,

B. Theſis 56.

By what hath been ſaid it is apparent, that juſtification in title may be aſcribed to ſeverall cauſes.

1. The

1. *The principall efficient cauſe is God.*

2. *The inſtrumentall is the promiſe or grant of the new Covenant.*

3. *The Procatartick cauſe (ſo far as God may be ſaid to be moved by any thing out of himſelf, ſpeaking after the manner of men) is fourfold.*

1 *And chiefly, the ſatisfaction of Chriſt.*

2 *The interceſſion of Chriſt, and ſupplication of the ſinner.*

3 *The neceſſity of the ſinner.*

4 *The opportunity and advantage for the glorifying of his juſtice and mercie.*

The firſt of theſe is the meritorious cauſe: the ſecond, the morall perſwading cauſe: the third is the objective: and the fourth is the occaſion.

2. *Materiall cauſe properly it hath none, if you will improperly call Chriſts ſatisfaction the remote matter, I contend not.*

3. *The formall cauſe is acquiting of the ſinner from the accuſation and condemnation of the Law, or the diſabling the Law to accuſe or condemn him.*

4. *The finall cauſe is the glory of God, and of the Mediator, and the deliverance of the ſinner.*

5. *The* Cauſa ſine qua non, *is both Chriſts ſatisfaction, and the faith of the juſtifyed.*

It muſt be granted that he is not a man of delicacies, hath a dull eye, and dry brain, whoſoever is not enamoured with ſo fair a ſhew of cauſes, like a cup-bord of rich glaſſes ſet in artificiall order, and able to dazle the eye of the beholder; what pity is it that any one of them ſhould meet with a knock and be broken, and ſo the beautifull order in which they were placed, be on a ſuddain marred; yet if ſuch a thing ſhould fall out, it were no great wonder. Pretineſſe and ſtrength are rarely twins, and we ſpeak of prety things but rarely, long in the preſent tenſe, before their periſhing by weakneſſe forceth us to take up another tone, and to tell that there was ſuch a delicate toy, but if we ſeek it, the place thereof is not to be found. It is poſſible ſuch a ſtroke may befall the image that Mr. *Baxter* hath here ſet up in imitation of that of *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Dan.* 2. 31, 32, 33, &c. it hath clay in the feet, cannot goe without halting, if it meet with a ſtone to cruſh its toes, it may poſſibly fall all to ſhivers. Himſelf ſeems to doubt of it, therefore prepares himſelf to de-

tend it, as ſeeing, it cannot defend him or it ſelf. So ſaith he in the Explication.

B. *Here it will be expected that I anſwer to theſe Queſtions,*

1. *Why I call the Goſpell the Inſtrumentall cauſe?*
2. *Why I call Chriſts ſatisfaction the Meritorious cauſe, and the* Cauſa ſine qua non *?*
3. *Why I make not Chriſts righteouſneſſe the Materiall cauſe.*
4. *Why I make not the imputation of it the formall cauſe?*
5. *Why I make not faith the Inſtrumentall cauſe?*
6. *Why I make it only the* Cauſa ſine qua non?

To theſe Quæries it will be expected (ſaith he) that he anſwer. But what if other beſides theſe exceptions be made, though it be in his power to deny his anſwer, yet it is not in his choice or authority to reſtrain any from excepting.

1 Perhaps ſome may except why he in aſſerting God to be the principall efficient cauſe of Juſtification, lets it paſſe ſo nakedly without an adjection of any of his attributes; ſo leaving it doubtfull whether it be the grace or the juſtice, the love or the hatred, the mercy or the wrath of God that is the efficient of Juſtification. We may eaſily anſwer our ſelves as to this queſtion, It is not Gods, but Mr. *Baxters* juſtification whereof the cauſes are here aſſigned, ſuch as the Scriptures are unacquainted with, a juſtification of his own deviſing, defining and diſtinguiſhing, himſelf and none before himſelf (that I know) was in every point acquainted with it: No marvell then if he ſpeak differingly in ſetting forth the cauſes of his, from our Divines in laying down the cauſes of Gods juſtification. And indeed it is a difficult queſtion to determine whether his juſtification (if it were at all granted to be of God) might challenge more properly the love or the hatred, the grace or the juſtice of God for its womb: It being a juſtification that leaves all men under the curſe, under the wrath of God, both in life and in death, until the very day of Judgment, (as we have found him diſputing moſt profoundly in and under his 9. *Theſis.*) A juſtification that gives only a titular title without actuall and abſolute poſſeſſion of any greateſt or leaſt benefit to the juſtifyed, [which according to Mr. *Baxter* is the ſame thing as if we ſhould ſay to the unjuſtifyed,] A juſtification more unpoſſible to be apprehended and held, then was the firſt juſtification by works, that was held forth upon poſſible tearms, exacting from a living man only

only continuance in the works of life; this upon unpoſſible (as reſpecting our preſent ſtate of infirmity) offering to a dead ſoul righteouſneſſe and life, upon condition the dead ſoul will quicken and ariſe from the dead to fetch it thence, whither if it come it muſt ſtill abide empty as it came, untill the day of Judgment, and then Mr. *Baxter* will come again to tell us more of his minde whether it be at all attainable. I do not at all injury the man in ſaying he offers juſtification to a dead ſoul, &c. upon condition the ſoul will quicken it ſelf. For let there be found but one clauſe in his whole book that implyeth a concurrence and effuſion of grace from God, more to the quickning and juſtifying of *Peter* and *Paul*, then of *Cain* and *Judas*, of the damned then of the ſaved. Or what doth he leſſe that brings in works to juſtification, then deſtroy grace, to ſet up juſtification after the order and rule of ſtrict juſtice? Or when Mr. *Baxter* is ſo exact in enumerating the *Procatarctical* or outwardly moving cauſes; to what purpoſe doth he jumpe over the *Proegumene* or inward moving cauſe, *viz.* the grace, love, and mercy which is within God himſelf, but to impriſon it in darkneſſe and eclipſe its glory, that mans righteouſneſſe might have the praiſe which pertains to God alone?

2 It may be alſo queſtioned, why amongſt all the cauſes of juſtification here aſſigned, there is no mention made of union and communion with Chriſt; when as our Divines following the rule of the Word, makes our union with him the very chief cauſe and ground of our being juſtifyed or declared to be juſtifyed according to the Goſpell juſtification, 1 *Joh.* 5: 12. *Phil.* 3. 9. 1 *Cor.* 5. 19. and a multitude of other Scriptures which they alleadge, and if there were the leaſt need I might here quote a ſcore. What elſe but an evill eye, maligning the praiſe of God and of his Chriſt, ſuppreſſeth in ſilence and ſuffers not to appear in the chain of the cauſes of juſtification this link of union with Chriſt. Is it not that he will make our faith and works yet out of Chriſt the cauſe of our union with Chriſt, and not this the ground of the other?

3 To come to thoſe queſtions which Mr. *Baxter* anſwereth becauſe he conceives it will be expected.

1. About the inſtrumentall cauſe, we queſtion not what he goes about to anſwer why he cals the promiſe or grant of the new Covenant, or the Goſpell, the inſtrumentall cauſe of juſti-

fication actively considered? but 1. Why he makes it the only instrumental cause, of justification howsoever considered? For this grant and promise doth by it self no more justifie the believers then the infidels, the justifyed then the unjustifyed. Doth not God also make the spirit his instrument of justifying, by declaring and unfolding the doctrine of the Gospell, and evidencing and witnessing to the soul remission and justification, together with the love and grace of God from which this justification floweth? Why doth he stifle the working of the Spirit from having to do in this great work, except either with the Sadduces he denies the being, or with the Socinians the divinity and divine operation of the Spirit, or else to leave open a door to let in justification by the flesh not by the Spirit, by the strength of mans free will without the preventing helps of the Spirit of grace? Or as justification is taken passively for our being justifyed in our selves, why is not faith put as an instrumentall cause also? But this Mr. *Baxter* will answer anon, and I shall wait on him to hear how satisfactory his answer is.

2. Whether in his answer to the Question as he puts it, when he makes a *mans lease or deed of gift, and a Kings pardon* to have their force *from the hand and seal annexed to it*, is it not much more implyed that the grant of the Gospell without hand and seal put to it is not a sufficient instrument to the justifying of any man. For the grant of the Gospell is made to the world indefinitely, but when faith as the impression of Gods hand upon the soul, and the Spirit witnessing and sealing to the conscience thou art the person to whom the justification generally proposed in the Gospell doth particularly belong, and so are applyed by God as true accessary evidences to the grant of the Gospell, to terminate justification upon the soul of man, can Mr. *Baxter* deny these being acts of God distinct from the word of promise, to be instrumentall to justification as properly and fully as the said promise and grant?

3. To his *Procatarctick causes* which in the *Thesis* he giveth [*viz. so far as God may be said to be moved by any thing out of himself, speaking after the manner of men*, saith he] I aske

1 Whether God may be moved in his will, by any thing out of himself? If so, whether then something out of God do not give *magis & minus*, increase and diminution to God? For every change of Gods will is a change of God himself, and what shall

is

it avail any to be justifyed by a mutable God that to day will justifie, to morrow unjustifie againe, being apt to take impression of change from things without him? yea if a God mutable, then in truth no God, but one of the Pagans Idols or Puppets. Or how little doth his additionall cause help him, [*to speake after the manner of men*] he ought not to speak a lie for God to please men; much lesse to lie against God, to fashion himself to the manners of men, foolish or wicked men. If he say God cannot be moved by any thing out of himself, how can he excuse himself from being a slanderer of the most high God, by devising and asserting here 4. causes out of God moving him to justifie us, having before wilfully suppressed in darkness the riches of Gods grace within himself allsufficient without any auxiliary strength from the creature to move him? How preposterous is he herein to the order of nature, making the fruit to bear the tree, and not the tree the fruit? What lesse doth he in making Christs satisfaction and intercession, the sinners supplication and desire of supply, and the opportunity or advantage, for the glorifying of his justice and mercie, the causes of Gods will, and gracious willings, when contrariwise Gods gracious will is the cause of all these?

2 Whether he jears at the invaluable means of our salvation, or else that he thinks himself matching cocks for the game, that he counterpoiseth the highest perfections of Christs mediatorship with mans vanity? how unsufferable is it to see him putting into the one scale a precious pearl, into the other a peppercorn or cherry stone? To match Christs intercession with the sinners supplication? To make the feebleness of man, a collaterall and concause in the same order and degree of efficacy to justification, with the vertue of Christ glorifyed? It is to be acknowledged that the nothingness of the one is of as full validity as the omnipotency (if I may so terme it) of the other to beget new love, new purposes, new acts in Gods will. This is that which God himself cannot do, not because it is a work above his power, but beneath his nature and perfection, to work or to be capable of the working of any new impressions or changes in his will. Nevertheless this excuseth not Mr. *Baxter* vilifying of Christ in mating his intercession with the sinners supplication, as if the former were a star of the same magnitude with the latter: like that prosane fellow that twisted together Religion and Cheese.

3 Not to trifle away time upon every trifling word of Mr. *Baxter*, I demand of him why (seeing in the Explication, *pa.* 215. he acknowledgeth that *Procatarctically or* [*outwardly*] *impulsive causes have properly no place with God*] he doth yet in his *Thesis* here fetch about again his four impulsive causes to marke them with severall names in their foreheads in *Aristotles* print? is it not a testimony under his own hand that he will rather play and dance about God as if he were a meer may-pole, then lose the ostentation of one least peece of his wit and art?

4 Though I mean not to contend about the meritorious causality of Christs satisfaction, because in this he hath as well many orthodox writers as Papists speaking in the same tone with him: nevertheless I should deny his assertion unless he he will grant me these 4. or 5. suppositions.

1. That so far as justification is an act eternall and immanent in God, Christs satisfaction is not the meritorious cause of it.

2. If in some other respect it be the meritorious cause, that God doth therein merit from himself. For the satisfaction made to him is of his own proper money, himself paid the price in delivering his Sonne for our sinnes, the body which Christ offered for us was given him by the Father to offer in our behalf.

3. That this merit must in no wise hinder, but that the entire benefit of justification must come to us freely without money and without price.

4. That it is but unproperly termed merit even then when it respecteth the discharge which God giveth into a mans conscience, it being so called metaphorically as our state in sin is considered as a state of debt, which when Christ our surety hath paid for us he hath so far merited only, as the payment of our debt may be said to deserve that we should receive a full acquittance from the debt. In which Mr. *Baxter* goeth yet further, that it was so paid, that the Creditour might have chosen to accept it for satisfaction, much more to have given us a full acquittance and discharge. So that in relation to him and his principles, it is lesse properly merit, then to another.

5. That Christs satisfaction is more properly to be called Gods foundation of this our new relation of justifyed persons upon

upon which he hath inabled himſelf to juſtifie us in mercie, without any ſeeming diminution of his juſtice and truth. Theſe things granted me, I diſmiſſe Mr. *Baxter* with his meritorious cauſe.

5 When he cals Chriſts interceſſion and the ſinners ſupplication the morall perſwading cauſe, &c. I demand whether there were ſuch a totall deficiency, or ſo great a ſcarcity of morall reaſon in God, that it needed a begetting or quickning by perſwaſions from without him? or whether he were ſo flinty as that without ſtrong perſwaſive reaſons he could not be induced to melt out his mercy in juſtifying us? *How then was he in Chriſt reconciling the world to himſelf before all ſuch actuall interceſſion and prayers?* 2 *Cor.* 5. 19.

6. The like might I ſay of his objective and occaſionall cauſes; that objects and occaſions have their being and qualifications from Gods either directive or promiſſive providence, that they may ſerve to hiseternall and abſolute volſitions and purpoſes; not that they work any new thing in the will and purpoſes of God, for then like the Maſſe-prieſts ſhould they be the creators of their Creator.

4. To his ſecond Queſtion, *Why he cals Chriſts ſatisfaction, both the Meritorious cauſe, and the Cauſa ſine qua non,* If he had not, I ſhould not have made it a queſtion. But becauſe he delighteth both to put the queſtion and to anſwer it, I ſhall not permit his anſwer wholly to paſſe without a ſhort reply.

B *Pag.* 215. *That it is the Meritorious cauſe I know few but Socinians that will deny.*

He muſt needs mean few *Baxterians*, that are not alſo *Socinians*, *i.e.* few of them that with him deny juſtification to be an eternall immanent act in God. For Mr. *Baxter* himſelf whether he be, or be not a Socinian, will and muſt grant, that if juſtification be, and as far as it is an eternall immanent act in God; Chriſts ſatisfaction neither is nor can be the Meritorious cauſe thereof. But as we look to the jnſtification, as in time applyed and declared to the ſoul and conſcience which Mr. *Baxter* calleth the juſtification of the new Covenant, and the Scriptures juſtification by faith, of this juſtification I will not contend with him, but Chriſts ſatisfaction (though no where in the word *eadem verbis* ſo termed) yet may enough properly be termed the Meritorious cauſe.

But

3 Not to trifle away time upon every trifling word of Mr. *Baxter*, I demand of him why (seeing in the Explication pa. 215. he acknowledgeth that *Procatarctically or* [*outwardly*] *impulsive causes have properly no place with God*] he doth yet in his Thesis here fetch about again his four impulsive causes to marke them with severall names in their foreheads in *Aristotles* print? Is it not a testimony under his own hand that he will rather play and dance about God as if he were a meer may-pole then lose the ostentation of one least peece of his wit and art?

4 Though I mean not to contend about the meritorious causality of Christs satisfaction, because in this he hath as well many orthodox writers as Papists speaking in the same tone with him: nevertheless I should deny his assertion unless first he will grant me these 4. or 5. suppositions.

1. That so far as justification is an act eternall and immanent in God, Christs satisfaction is not the meritorious cause of it.

2. If in some other respect it be the meritorious cause, then God doth therein merit from himself. For the satisfaction made to him is of his own proper money, himself paying the price in delivering his Sonne for our sinnes, the blood which Christ offered for us was given him by the Father to offer in our behalf.

3. That this merit must in no wise hinder, but that the entire benefit of justification must come to us freely without money and without price.

4. That it is but unproperly termed merit even then when it respecteth the discharge which God giveth into a mans conscience, it being so called metaphorically as our state in sin considered as a state of debt, which when Christ our surety hath paid for us he hath so far merited only, as the payment of a debt may be said to deserve that we should receive a full acquittance from the debt. In which Mr. *Baxter* goeth yet further that it was so paid, that the Creditour might have chosen to accept it for satisfaction, much more to have given us a full quittance and discharge. So that in relation to him and his principles, it is lesse properly merit, then to another.

5. That Christs satisfaction is more properly to be called Gods foundation of this our new relation of justifyed per-

upon which he hath inabled himself to justifie us in mercie, without any seeming diminution of his justice and truth. These things granted me, I dismisse Mr. *Baxter* with his meritorious cause.

5. When he cals Christs intercession and the sinners supplication the morall perswading cause, &c. I demand whether there were such a totall deficiency, or so great a scarcity of morall reason in God, that it needed a begetting or quickning by perswasions from without him? or whether he were so flinty as that without strong perswasive reasons he could not be induced to melt out his mercy in justifying us? *How then was he in Christ reconciling the world to himself before all such actuall intercession and prayer?* 2 *Cor.* 5. 19.

6. The like might I say of his objective and occasionall causes; that objects and occasions have their being and qualifications from Gods either directive or promissive providence, that they may serve to his eternall and absolute volitions and purposes; not that they work any new thing in the will and purposes of God, for then like the Masse-priests should they be the creators of their Creator.

4. To his second Question, *Why he cals Christs satisfaction, both the Meritorious cause, and the Causa sine qua non,* If he had not, I should not have made it a question. But because he delighteth both to put the question and to answer it, I shall not permit his answer wholly to passe without a short reply.

B. *Pag.* 215. *That it is the Meritorious cause I know few but Socinians that will deny.*

He must needs mean few *Baxterians*, that are not also *Socinians*, i.e. few of them that with him deny justification to be an eternall immanent act in God. For Mr. *Baxter* himself whether he be, or be not a Socinian, will and must grant, that if justification be, and as far as it is an eternall immanent act in God; Christs satisfaction neither is nor can be the Meritorious cause thereof. But as we look to the justification, as in time applyed and declared to the soul and conscience which Mr. *Baxter* calleth the justification of the new Covenant, and the Scriptures justification by faith, of this justification I will not contend with him, but Christs satisfaction (though no where in the word *idem verbis* so termed) yet may enough properly be termed the meritorious cause.

But

But why he will also have it called the *Causa sine qua non*, a blinde man may easily see his reason; what else doth he drive at but to put it in the same order of Causality with faith and good works, which also in the whole sequele of this Treatise is with him the *Causa sine qua non*, and consequently to make Christs sufferings and mans qualifications collaterall causes of Justification? Hereunto pertaineth his extolling the cause *sine qua non*, and exalting the praise thereof above other causes, not so much to attribute it to Christs satisfaction, as prepositively to deifie and equalize with Christ the meritorious perfection of mans righteousnesse, which he is bringing in as a rivall of Christ for the honor of justification; and herein he will rather turn Cynick then leave the praise of man in his justification any one inch beneath the praise of Christ. For hereunto pertaines his *Quare me non laudas qui dignus sum accipiam? Plus enim est meruisse quam dedisse beneficium*? If God is to be praised for giving justification, why not I that am worthy to receive it? for it is more honourable to have deserved then to have given a Benefit. How well this agreeth with those which he hath in and under his 24, 26, & 27. *Theses*, I leave the Reader to consider; and how fully he speaks it out in the following doctrine of this book, we shall see more fully afterward. Yea when he here puts Christs satisfaction in the same kind of causality with faith and works, which he here cals the Causa *sine qua non*, elsewhere the conditions of justification; and Thes. 62. pronounceth faith to be the principall, and works the less principall condition; what place doth he leave for Christs satisfaction, but to be a footstool to our faith and works?

Pag. 216, 217.

Ob. Yes he reserves the entire praise of merit still to Christs satisfaction alone.

Answ. Not so, for though in words he sometimes affirms Christs satisfaction to be the merit of our justification, yet he makes the worthinesse of our own righteousnesse to be that which makes both Christs merit and justification merited to be ours, and so we out-merit Christ, deserving not only justification but Christ the meriter, and the merit of Christ to be made ours: In this he is worse then the Papists. They give the praise of our merit to Christ; he hath merited (saith they) a power to our works to merit. This man contrariwise, that neither Christs merits, nor justification the fruit of it becomes our

untill we by our merits and worthinesse have put our selves into the possession of it; so according to the Papists the efficacy of mans merits depends upon Christs merits: according to Mr. *Baxter* the efficacy of Christs merits (as to this or that justified person) depends upon a mans own merits, as in the fore noted *Thesis* he manifesteth himself: Let all men judge whether his ambition bends not to be more then an approver, even an eminent improver of Popery.

5. To his third question somewhat also. In the *Thesis* where he gives us the order of the causes of justification, to set up his own, not Gods justification, he saith,

B. *Materiall cause properly it hath none; if you will improperly call Christs satisfaction the remote matter, I contend not.*

And in the explication *pa.* 214. against what he had said in the *Thesis*, he supposeth it will be questioned.

B. 3. *Why he makes not Christs righteousnesse the Materiall cause?*

And *pag.* 217. He thus answers the question:

B. *Christs righteousnesse cannot be the materiall cause of an act which hath no matter. If any will call Christs righteousnesse, the matter of our righteousnesse, though yet they speak unproperly, yet far neerer the truth then to call it the matter of our justification.*

We have here as elsewhere a Momus among the Gods, a curious and carping Critick against not only Ecclesiasticall but Canonicall writings also, no farther owning what they speak then as they speak it in a dialecticall dialect, so setting *Aristotle* above Christ and weighing all the sentences of the Gospell in the scales of Logicall terms and maxims, and *Socinus*-like submitting all the truths of the Gospell to reason, yea to the rules of *Aristotles* logick or reason; *Justification is an act*, saith he, *and there is no matter of an act*, ergo, *it hath no materiall cause.* Christ therefore and his Apostles, yea all the Doctors of the Church that speak after the Scriptures, are dunces, delivering a vain Theologie not truely Theologicall, because not after the Peripateticks precepts totally Logicall.

But what law of Medes and Persians can binde the holy Ghost never to mention justification but strictly under the consideration of an act? Will Mr. *Baxter* deny it sometimes to be used in a passive sense? Or what he saith of faith *Thesis* 62. may in

not more truly be affirmed of justification, *That as a whole Country oft takes it name from the chief City, so may all the privileges and benefits of the Gospell from justification*, so that when it is named all the rest are implyed and named under it? The thing in question I acknowledge, (Mr. *Baxter* granting what he grants) is not of great moment; but the supercilious haughtinesse of the man puft with the opinion of his secular learning so high as to put and pisse at so many excellent Divines for learning and holinesse, to many of which he is not worthy to be an *Antecessor*, is unsufferable. I shall therefore as briefly as I can expresse upon what grounds our Divines and how far they make the righteousnesse of Christ the matter of our justification, as near as I may upon good probabilities conjecture.

The Doctrine of justification by Christ, is no where in the four Evangelists held forth under the name of justification or justifying. Many both Parables and clear doctrines that proceeded from the lips of Christ, do indeed in other words fully display it; specially *John* the Evangelist, who made it more his task to record the doctrine then the acts of Christ (because he saw those historifyed somewhat largely by the other three Evangelists which had written before him,) Eagle-like mounting on high to the contemplation of his Celestiall and Divine nature and doctrine, very exactly sets it forth but under other words, naming it *Life, eternall Life, everlasting Life*; *He that beleeveth in the Son hath everlasting life*, Joh. 3. 36. *Is passed from death to life*, Joh. 5. 24. *Hath eternall life*, Joh. 6. 54. *My flesh which I give for the life of the world*, Joh. 6. 51. *And ye will not come to me that ye may have life*, Joh. 5. 40. *Except ye eat my flesh and drink my bloud, ye have no life in you, he that eateth me shall live by me*, Joh. 6. 57. In all which and many other texts of this Evangelist none can deny but by life is to be understood chiefly, if not only, life in law, the life of justification, not that of glory which is to be received above, but that of grace here. For so those Scriptures point out a life here in this present world enduring everlastingly to all eternity, and not a life here only to be hoped for, and hereafter to come into our fruition. Neither do I find the word [justifie] used but once by *Luke* in the *Acts of the Apostles*. Nor yet at all in any one of the Epistles of the Apostles (St. *James* only excepted in one Chapter) but by the Apostle *Paul* alone. Yet the substance of justification was the chief doctrine in all their Epistles handled, but the same set

forth

forth under the name of *Salvation, saving, life*, and other phrases which our Saviour himself used. And these phrases also doth St. *Paul* use as equipollent with the word Justifying in all his Epistles.

Now the reason why this Apostle more then the rest treats of this doctrine under the name of [justification] I conceive to be this; Because he was forced to handle it by way of controversie against the false Apostles, some professing, some rejecting Christ, that taught justification and salvation by the works of the Law in part, and not by faith only; whom therefore he must needs in his disputes treat with in their own tearms and words. Their Argumentation against the Apostle (as may be gathered from the Apostles answers) ran in this tenour and to this effect, That righteousnesse alone which justifyeth or maketh a man perfectly righteous, saveth. But the righteousnesse of the Law, is that righteousnesse alone which justifyeth or maketh man perfectly righteous, at least by procuring proper righteousnesse to him: therefore that alone saveth.

The Apostle here granteth the proposition, that no other righteousnesse but that which justifyeth or maketh a man perfectly righteous saveth: But denyeth the assumption, that the righteousnesse of the Law only or at all justifyeth or maketh a man perfectly righteous: Because only the perfect doers of the law are perfectly righteous, not the hearers. But no man can perfectly do it. And contrariwise proveth that the righteousnes of the Gospel which he cals *the Righteousnesse of God, the Righteousnesse of faith, the Righteousnesse of God by faith*, which consisteth in Christs satisfaction imputed to us, is the Righteousnesse which justifyeth and maketh perfectly righteous, because it cleanseth from the guilt and freeth from the imputation of all sin and unrighteousnesse. *Rom.* 1. 17. & 3. 5, 21, 22, 25, 26. & 4. 3, 5, 6, 11. & 5. 17, 18, 21. & 9. 30. & 10. 3, 4, 6. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Phil.* 3. 9. In all which places and in many other the Apostle having rejected the righteousnesse of works from being, asserteth the righteousnesse of God in Christ by faith, to be the righteousnesse, the matter and substance of the righteousnesse by which we are justifyed. This he illustrateth *Rom.* 5. 19. by a comparison between *Adam* and *Christ*, *Adams* disobedience and *Christs* obedience; *As by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous*: the ones disobedience was not only the

merit, but also the matter of our sin, as far as sin is capable of matter, the very sin it self, which being imputed to us as being in him, without any personall and actuall sin of our own, makes us sinners. So the obedience of Christ in offering himself a sacrifice for sin, and giving satisfaction to Gods justice in obedience to that positive command of the Father which required it, was and is not only the merit, but also the matter of that righteousnesse which being imputed to us (as being in Christ) without any personall obedience of ours added to it, constituteth us righteous and justifyed in Gods acceptance, or is that for by and in which the Lord pronounceth us just and justifyed to our own consciences. Such is the frequent dispute of the Apostle about the substance and matter of that righteousnesse by which we are justifyad, which he concludes not to be a righteousnesse inherent in us, but this *Righteousnesse inherent in Christ, but imputed to us and apprehended by faith to justification; whom God hath set forth as a propitiation for our sinnes through faith in his blood*, Rom. 3. 25. And this is all that I finde our Divines to mean in saying the righteousnesse or satisfaction of Christ is the materiall cause of our justification defending against the Papists as the Apostle did against the Pharisees, that the matter of the righteousnesse which God accepteth and imputeth to us in justifying us, or unto righteousnesse and justification, is this righteousnesse of Christ only, not the righteousnesse of works. Mr. *Baxter* in rejecting the phrase, 1. As rude and not Logicall; 2. As at the best unproper; doth first, accuse the Apostle; and secondarily, them that follow his Apostolicall doctrine and phrase, of this rudeness and impropriety of language: One of them speaks out the minde of the rest, *Deus justitiam, i. e. Obedientiam & satisfactionem Christi nostram facit ac pro nostra ducit*, &c. *atque ita nos antequam justos pronunciet justos facit*; God makes the righteousnesse, *i. e.* the obedience and satisfaction of Christ ours, accounts it for ours, *&c.* and so before he pronounceth us he maketh us righteous. Let us be rude with the Apostle as long as we stand fixed in the doctrine of grace with the Apostles. That Mr. *Baxter* speaks more Logically after the Sophisters, and captivates himself to their learned errours (however he may applaud himself therein) we conceive it to deserve more pity then envie.

Scharpius wf. Theol. e justif. q. 925.

6. To his fourth Question I shall speak but little, because I understand him but little. Neither have I that edge upon my dull brain

brain to discern whether in his acuteneſſe he doth more contradict others or himſelf? or what other leaſt cauſe he hath to contradict (granting what he grants) ſave only the ſpirit of contradiction. The formall cauſe of juſtification in his *Theſis* we have thus;

B. *The formall cauſe is the acquitting of the ſinner from the accuſation and condemnation of the law, or the diſabling the law to accuſe or condemn him.*

The queſtion that he conceiveth will be put to him here to anſwer is;

B. *Why he makes not the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſſe the formall cauſe?*

To this he anſwers, p. 218.

B. *That imputation is not the forme is undeniable. The forme gives the name: eſpecially to actions that have no matter. Imputation and Juſtification, denote diſtinct acts; and how then can imputing be the form of juſtifying,* &c.

Here before I can nnderſtand the depths of Mr. *Baxter*, I muſt be reſolved by him in ſome Queries.

1. Whether juſtification hath its being before it hath its form? For the form doth more unexceptively give the being then the name; and is in order of nature before the thing formed or named.

2. If not, Whether then there were ever a juſtifyed man (after the tenour of the new Covenant) upon earth, or ever ſhall be ſuch? For if the acquitting of the ſinner from the accuſation and condemnation of the Law, or the diſabling of the Law to accuſe or condemn, be the form of juſtification, then is juſtification unformed and without being (according to Mr. *Baxter*) untill the day of Judgment. Untill then he binds all hand and foot under the threatnings and curſe of the Law; as we have ſeen in and under his 9, 11, 12, & 13. *Theſis*, and how long after he doth not yet certifie us: ſo that if this be the form of juſtification, then after his principles there neither is nor ſhall be either juſtification or any juſtifyed perſon as long as the world laſteth, either in heaven or upon earth. Except Mr. *Baxter* will ſay the law is ſo dealt with by Chriſt, as *Cnipperdoling* was by *John a Leyden*, of the higheſt magiſtrate and judge made tormentor or hangman, depoſed from being any longer a righ-

teous Accuſer, Judge or Condemner of guilty perſons; and made an Executioner and Tormentor of them whom no Law accuſeth or condemneth.

3. Whether the Law accuſeth or condemneth of any thing else but of ſin? And if not, Whether Gods acquitting the ſinner from the Lawes accuſation and condemnation, be not his acquitting the ſinner from all ſin that might expoſe him to the Lawes accuſing and condemning? This Mr. *Baxter* muſt grant except he will ſay a man may be acquitted from the Lawes, yet left unto the Devils accuſation and condemnation, as he ſeems before to hint. But this is no other acquitting but from the frying-pan into the fire, from a juſt accuſer and Judge, into the tyranny of an unjuſt ſlanderer and deſtroyer. Such a juſtification with its form we decline as damnation it ſelfe: Mr. *Baxter* can with his Sophiſtry charm the Devill, let him grapple with him.

4. Whether the imputation of righteouſneſſe and the not imputing of ſin be not the ſame thing, neither an act diſtinct from the other, but each connoting and implying the other? For he anſwers the queſtion, denying imputation to be the form *viz.* imputation of righteouſneſſe, without the adject terms of diminution, the righteouſneſſe [*of Chriſt*] knowing well that ſome of the moſt conſiderate of the Antipapiſticall Divines place the form of juſtification, in the imputation of righteouſneſs, not in the imputation of Chriſts *righteouſneſſe* (*viz.* which he hath done). Theſe two Quæries he muſt grant us, except he will ſinke from his own principles, and contradict himſelf.

5. Whether then there be any difference between Mr. Baxters form of juſtification, and that form which he impugneth? Whether the acquitting of the ſinner from the Law, from ſin which expoſeth to the Lawes accuſation and condemnation, be not the ſame thing in ſubſtance with Gods imputing of righteouſneſſe and not imputing of ſin to him? What hath the one of the (ſave words alone) more or leſſe in it then the other? They muſt be Mr. *Baxters* Lynces eyes that are buſied in the ſpeculation of *Democritus* his *Atomes* and *Platoes Ideas*, that can diſcern the difference, my blunt fancie is uncapable and uncomprehenſive of it.

D. *I believe* (ſaith Mr. *Baxter*) *that this imputing doth in order of nature goe before juſtifying.*

An

And doth not the form in order of nature go before the thing formed? how else doth the form give it its *ultimum esse*? This more proves then denies imputation to be the form.

B. *And that the righteousnesse so imputed is the proper ground whence we are denominated legally righteous, and why the Law cannot condemn us.*

This also makes more for us, then for him. He tels us before that the forme gives the name. Now to be Legally righteous in Mr. *Baxters* phrase, is to be righteous in the righteousnesse of Christs satisfaction. He that is so, is justified in title of Law, (as Mr. *Baxter* termes it, and here treats of it) if then it give denomination of legally righteous, it gives the name of justification in title of Law; (except he will say that a man is legally righteous in Christ before Gods gracious act makes him such) if so, then is imputation the form of justification because it gives it the name. He concludes well;

B. *It is a vain thing to quarrell about the Logicall names of the causes of justification, if we agree in the matter.*

Yet see I no other grouud that Mr. *Baxter* hath to take up his quarrell against the whole stream of Protestant Divines in refusing and oppugning the form of justification which they give, but to quarrell about names and words. The form which he substituteth in place of theirs, being the same with theirs in substance, and differing only in Logicall not Theologicall names and words. Unlesse some will say there is a reall as well as a nominall difference between the disabling of the Law to accuse of sin, and Gods not imputing sin; *i. e.* between the Lawes acquitting, and Gods acquitting from sin; between the Lawes not imputing unrighteousnesse, and Gods imputing righteousnesse; which is all one as if I should put a difference between the pardon that disables the Law of the Land from accusing and condemning of a malefactor, and a pardon which acquits him from the offence which the same Law had power to accuse him of, or between the not accusing or condemning of a man, and the not imputing any thing to him to his accusation and condemnation.

CHAP.

Chap. XXV.

Arg. Of the Causa sine qua non, *or the condition or the instrumentall cause, and whether faith be the instrument? And in what sense it is so? The absurdities wherewith Mr.* Baxter *chargeth this doctrine, removed; and those that follow his doctrine in part particularized.*

TO the first Question we must apply our selves somewhat more fully, because in answer to the former Question Mr. *Baxter* seems to me to have aimed chiefly to the ostentation of his wit and Logicall both acuteness and profoundness, to make himself thereby admired and formidable. But in answering this and the next he collects in one all his subtilty and Sophistry to beguile and deceive (if it were possible) the very Elect. And indeed if he carry these two Questions in captivity to his own sense and purpose, he shall thereby make at least a seeming way by which to introduce all his Popish soul-subverting errors (about justification) which follow and hang as at the tayle of these Questions. His words in the *Thesis* are.

B. *The* Causa sine qua non *is both Christs satisfaction, and the faith of the justifyed.*

As much as he thought would be objected against his putting Christs satisfaction in the same place and degree of causality as a collaterall with faith, he hath spoken to in his answer to the second Question, and the firmness of this his answer hath been there examined. But what concernes faith, that which he thinks he shall be opposed in, he formes into two Questions, Explication, *pa.* 214.

1. *Why he makes it not the Instrumentall cause?*
2. *Why he makes it the* Causa sine qua non?

The former which is his 5. Question, he applies himself to answer *pa.* 219. in these words,

B. *To the fifth Question, perhaps I shall be blamed, as singular from men in denying faith to be the instrument of our justification: But affectation of singularity leads me not to it.*

1. *If faith be an instrument, it is the instrument of God or man: Not of man, for man is not the principall efficient, he doth not justifie himself.*

2. *Not of God: for* 1. *It is not God that beleeveth, though it is true he is the first cause of all actions.* 2. *Man is the causa secunda between God and the action; and so still man should be said to justifie himself.* 3. *For* (as Aquinas) *the action of the principall cause, and of the instrument, is one action; and who dares say that faith is a Gods instrument?* 4. *The instrument must have influx to the producing of the effect of the principall cause by a proper causality, and who dare say that faith hath such an influx into our justification?*

Here I know not whether we have more of the subtle serpent, or of the roaring Lyon.

1. He useth his winding Sophistry to intangle.

2. His daring threats to them that being not intangled will be bold as to contradict him. Let us examine what efficacy is there in either or both these, and first in his Sophistry.

To insinuate or (as the Apostle saith) *to creep into the hearts* of his Readers to deceive them, he tels us, *Perhaps he may be blamed as singular from all men in denying faith to be an instrument of justification.* It seems he doubted that some of his Readers for lack of acquaintance with many Authours upon this subject, would not, or could not take notice that it is a new doctrine which he here delivereth, and so he should be robbed of the glory of his new invention. That the praise thereof might therefore wholly redound to him, he tels them, he is the first of men that ever saw and taught Faith not to be the instrument of justification; that herein he is singular from all men. But had he not rubbed his forehead, that with open face he thus vindicateth to himself that which he hath received from the Priests and Jesuites? Let him name himself singular and abhorrent from all Protestants, yea from Christ and his Apostles, not from all men; he is singular and alone in this and most his assertions from the Orthodox, from whom, but holds it in common with the whole herd of Antichrist, to whom he is fallen. Doth not *Bellarmine* deny *that faith can truly be said to justifie us, except it doth obtain and in some sort merit Justification from God?* Do not all his brethren with one voice shake off the instrumentall causality of justification and make it as a perfect quality or good work to merit it?

A two fold subtlety, yea falshood, is there to be found therefore in this his insinuation:

1. That he affirmes himself singular in this point, to catch after an usurped praise to himself, as if he had seen what none in the world before him had seen.

2. In pretending it to be a new doctrine, thereby to draw disciples after him in a time wherein the ears of men itch after new in disdain of sound and true doctrines. But further to insinuate he tels us that affectation of singularity leads him not to it. We beleeve him without oath or protestation. It is not the desire of them that are of his hair to trudge single, but accompanied with a whole Brigade of disciples under their conduct and seducing unto *Rome*. But let us come to his Arguments.

B. *If faith be an instrument, it is the instrument of God or Man. But neither of these*; Ergo *not at all an instrument.*

His Propositon or Major we grant him. And it were more and full to that which can be expected to resell his reasons which he brings for the proof of the minor. Yet, because my drift is not so much to answer him, as to stablish some weak and unwary Christians against his impostures, I shall endeavour first to confirm what he denyeth and seeks to shiver, and then to examine the strength of reason which he brings against us.

When he saith in the Minor, that faith is the instrument neither of God nor Man in justification; What if I should undertake to prove and defend it to be the instrument of both? He speaketh here of Justification as taken Passively, declared to, and terminated upon the conscience. For if we should mention justification as taken meerly Actively, for that internall, eternall and immanent act in God; not transient upon an extraneous subject, but bide in God before the world was, or any justifyed or unjustifyed persons began to live or be: Mr. *Baxter* would be ready to deal with us as did the *Jewes* with *Steven*, *Act.* 7. 57. stop his ears and cry out against us with a loud voice, Blasphemy, blasphemy. Yet in this sense we acknowledge that faith is neither Gods nor Mans instument of justification. But in that sense which alone Mr. *Baxter* here taketh justification for that gracious act of God by which he dischargeth for Christs sake the sinner from condemnation, by vertue of the new Covenant, and that pretious Gospel promise, *He that beleeveth in the Son shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death to life*: so I affirm faith to be both Gods and Mans

ment instrument, Gods effective and mans receptive instrument, in relation to justification, as shall be beneath more fully explained.

First, it is Gods instrument. This justification is but Gods pronouncing and declaring a man to his own conscience to be just and discharged from sin and condemnation through Christ, so that he perceives and apprehends himself absolved and doth acquiesce in this absolution. One chief instrument by which God doth thus justifie or declare and manifest man to himself just and pardoned, is faith. This is Gods instrument in the same sense in which Mr. *Baxter* maketh the promise and grant of the new Covenant to be Gods instrument, and that more fully (as I in part shewed before.) For that grant doth but declare a possibility to a man (as it is considered by it self) to be justifyed; promising forgiveneſſe and life to all that shall beleeve. By this act alone no singular person is actually justifyed. But now this grant premised, when God is pleased to infuse faith into the soul of any singular person, by it as by his instrument he declareth that person to himself just and acquitted from condemnation; so that he can thenceforth plead out his own justification. God hath pronounced them all just and pardoned which beleeve in his Son: I so beleeve, therefore I am pronounced and declared of God just and pardoned. So this faith is the instrument of God, (for so Lawyers term Deeds and Grants in writing, *instruments*, yea instruments of him that makes the Deed or Grant.) And the promise of the new Covenant or the new Testament is called *novum Instrumentum*; as it is his evidence written (not without the man as that Gospell grant) but by the finger of Gods Spirit in the hearts of the Elect, so that they may read this instrument of Gods writing within their hearts evidencing and manifesting to themselves their justification from God. And this is one principall instrument and evidence of God promised under the new Covenant, *Jer.* 31. 31--35. recited (as now fulfilled) by the Apostle, *Heb.* 8. 8--12. & 10. 16, 17. *I will write my Lawes in their hearts*, &c. what Law but the rule, doctrine and evidence of life and salvation? But what benefit by having it written within them, more then if it were in writing without them? Yes this, *They shall not need* [externall] *teaching to know the Lord, for they shall all know me from the least to the greatest.* What knowledg of God was this whereupon they should not need teachers? They shall *know him to be their God, their Justifyer,*

their Saviour, for so much intimate the next words, *For I will forgive their iniquities, and remember their sins no more.* This was the chief part of the Law, or will of God written in their hearts, justification or everlasting remission of sins. This they should not need to be taught from without, the instrument of writing or evidence thereof should be within their own hearts apparent not to others but their own reading. And what more principall evidence or instrument of writing within our hearts then to assure us, then our faith, engraven by Gods own hand in us? I appeal to Mr. *Baxter* himself whether I wrest this Scripture from its proper sense; or if any shall except against me, I doubt not but I shall make it good to be the mind of the holy Ghost which I have here given. To the same purpose is it, that Faith is called the *Evidence of things not seen*, *Heb.* 11. 1. Which evidence Gods evidence given us, by which he declareth to us, and manifesteth to our consciences the invisible things of our justification and salvation: and when given, then our evidence also by which we not only apprehend, but also plead against all the accusations of the Law, yea of sin and Satan, our actuall justification. And that it is called *the witnesse of God in us*; or, within us; because God by this witnesse as his instrument declares and evidenceth us to our own consciences justifyed, 1 *Joh.* 5. 10.

Secondly, It is mans instrument by which he applyeth to himself, and without which he cannot applie to himself this justification, and remission of the new Covenant to know and be sensible of it, that he may rest and rejoyce in it, being justifyed in himself, i. e. in his own knowledge and conscience; *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing to them their trespasses*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. Reconciliation and Justification (as hath been shewed) are one and the same thing. That we may receive it therefore from him in Christ, he gives us (as many as are his Elect) this living faith as an instrument by which he may apply it and bring it home into our bosomes. Therefore is the operation of the soul by faith, set forth in the Scripture by a comparison of a mans working by the severall members of the body as by his instruments. Calling Faith sometimes the *eie of man* by which he looketh to Christ crucified as the *Israelites to the brazen Serpent*, thence to obtain cure to the wounded and poysoned soul, *Joh.* 3. 14, 15. Sometimes the *foot* of the soul by which it runs and comes to

Christ

Christ for life and justification, Joh. 5. 40. Sometimes the *hand* of the soul by which it apprehendeth Christ and the justification that is in and by him: *To as many as received him, to them he gave power to become the sons of God, even to as many as believe in his Name*, Joh. 1. 12. Sometimes the *mouth* of the soul by which *it eateth and drinketh in Christ with the life that is in him, both to* justifie and sanctifie, *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my bloud, hath eternall life*, Joh. 6. 54. *If ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious*, 1 Pet. 2. 3. Sometimes *the armes of the soul*, by which it embraceth and holdeth in possession Christ with his life and righteousnesse; *He that hath the Son hath life, he that hath not the Son hath not life*, 1 Joh. 5. 12. What doth all this imply lesse then that faith is instrumentall to our justification? Yea given to us to be the sole instrument on our part by which to apply to our selves the justification offered by God in Christ. Or what else is meant by the generall voice of the Gospell pronouncing us to be justifyed by faith, but by faith Gods instrument and evidence to declare and manifest it to our souls, and our instrument to apprehend and hold it fast and forth to our selves? It remaineth now to examin Mr. *Baxters* reasons by which he assayeth to prove that it is neither mans nor Gods instrument.

First, that it is not mans instrument, he thus argueth,

B. *Not mans instrument, for he is not the principall efficient, he doth not justifie himself.*

Both this and all that which followeth in this his dispute, he hath out of *Schiblers Metaphysicks*, sound enough (I acknowledge) as *Schibler* proposeth it in *Thesi*, but fallacious and misapplyed by this man to his Hypothesis. Yet what ever it be (though not the least portion of Gods word in it) let us examine the strength of it. It is the principall efficient, of the act or effect, that worketh by the instrument, saith he; but man is not the principall efficient, therefore worketh not in this businesse by instruments or instrumentall helps.

I answer 1. (not only in reference to this, but to that which also followeth in his Argumentation) We are to distinguish between instruments, that they are of two kinds, effective or receptive. Effective, so is a knife the instrument of cutting: Receptive, so is the hand the instrument of receiving. Mr. *Baxters* arguments are applyed to the former only, not at all to the latter. For

1. Of an Effective instument it may be said, the knife cuts and the Man cuts likewise: But a Receptive instrument hath a double relation; 1. To the giver; 2. To the receiver. As if a rich man give a great treasure to a poor man, he receiveth it in his hand: the receptive instrument of the poor mans inriching is his hand. Now if a man should argue as Mr. *Baxter* doth; the hand if it be an instrument it is an instrument either of the giver or receiver; not of the receiver, for he doth not inrich himself, he is not the principall agent inriching: not of the giver, for he doth not receive any riches, but the act of the hand is to receive; therefore the instrument of neither, nor at all an instrument: Who sees not the vanity of such an Argument? Yet such is this paralogism of Mr. *Baxter*. I say therefore that the Canons of an instrument which he citeth out of *Aquinas* and *Schibler*, hold only of effective, not of receptive instruments. Yet as faith is Gods effective instrument to justifie man, and not himself, (as Mr. *Baxter* trifleth) so these Canons hold of it also in the sense before specifyed.

2. I deny the Assumption or Minor; he proves it thus, *Man doth not justifie himself*. This is an equivocation, and besides the question. None ever made man the *causa prima* of his justification, none I mean of all those whom Mr. *Baxter* disputes against. Himself indeed and his followers asserting the perfection and merit of mans righteousnesse consisting in faith and good works, and affirming that this righteousnesse of man, and in man, doth give him title to the righteousnesse which is by Christ, cannot well be cleared from making man the first cause of his justification. But we speak nothing tending to this purpose; and in no other sense do we say that man acteth to his justification, but by this apprehending and applying to himself the justification of God. And in this respect man is not only the principall but also the sole efficient of apprehending or receiving Christ to justification, and faith his alone receptive instrument therein, by the instrumentall subservicncy of his faith in receiving Christ. We make it not mans instrument of Christs satisfaction, or of Gods acceptation, or of his declaring, but only of our applying it to our soules.

That it is not Gods instrument, he hath these reasons to prove.

B. 2. *Not of God*: for 1. *It is not God that believeth, though it is true he is the first cause of all actions.*

A meer bull, with which he jeers and scoffes, not only at all the Protestant Divines, but also at Christ and his Apostles, as poor sorry animals and asses, unworthy to be answered with reasons, but with absurd non-sense.

1. Faith in one was never used or ordained to be an instrument of justifying another, much lesse faith in God to justifie man.

2. He can conclude nothing else hence but this, God beleeveth not, therefore God is not justifyed or discharged from condemnation by the new Covenant.

3. He doth in the Magisteriall confidence of his heart, implicitely accuse Christ his Apostles and faithfull Teachers in his Church, to hold that God is the instrument of our justification, that the Principall agent and the instrument are the same thing, that the instrument must be in the Agent or cannot be his instrument, so that faith must be God himself, for whatsoever is in God is God himself; the immanent acts of God, are Gods acting. *These are all but slanderings of the Lords servants*, to make odious the doctrine which they deliver.

4. We make faith in man, not in God, Gods effective instrument, which he *infundendo creat & creando infundit*, and having wrought it in the soul, he doth put it also in acting, thereby to evidence to man his justification. As some great and munificent Lord having laid up a great treasure for one of his poorest and most abject servant in some secret place; tels him first what he hath done, bestowes it fully and freely upon him: but the servant not finding it is never the richer, because he hath not the possession of it. At length the Lord lights a torch, guides his servant to the secret place, and by the light of the torch shewes him the treasure (which before in the minde and purpose of the doner was wholly his) bids him to see and possesse: Here the torch is that Lords instrument by which he discovered to his servant the treasure, and evidenced him to be indeed enriched. So and much more compleatly is faith Gods instrument by which he justifies us to our selves, *i. e.* declareth and evidenceth us to be just and justifyed.

B. 2. *Man is the causa secunda between God and the action; and so man should be still said to justifie himself.*

Either I understand him not, or he speaks words without matter, or words that are nothing to the matter in hand. He is speak-

speaking of justification as of a transient act of God upon man in time. This act of God we acknowledge no other but God's declaring, and evidencing man to himself justifyed, Gods manifestation or pronouncing his justification to his conscience. How man in this act of God should be the *causa secunda* between God in the action, he explaines not, and I perceive not. That man is the *causa secunda* between God in the application of justification so manifested, I deny not. But in this doth man no more justifie himself then is above expressed. Or because it is faith in man which we pronounce to be Gods instrument of justifying; is therefore man *causa secunda*, or a self-justifyer? nay faith even in man is Gods Creature, and the same, nothing of mans essence; *Not of our selves, it is the gift of God*, Ephes. 2. 8. May not God lay up his own instruments where it pleaseth his will and wisdome, for his own use? or ceaseth it to be God's instrument or in Gods hand, when it is laid up in the heart of man for his good?

Obj. But faith acts not in man without man as the second cause acting it, and by such acting his faith, man doth justifie himself.

Sol. We make not man a stone, nor degrade him into a dead block; we grant of him that *actus agit*. He hath not lost his free-will but all possibility of being saved by it, all the spiritualnesse of it, that without a new reparation of it, it can will nothing in matters of salvation concurrent and conforming with the will of God. But all mans actings of his faith when he is so renewed and moved by the prime cause, is but to the receiving and application of his justification evidenced to him: As it is Gods instrument and acted by God, so it is Gods evidence to manifest to him his justification. It is Mr. *Baxter* and his fellowes that by their doctrine make men self-justifyers. Teaching that God's justification is conditionall, and the alone instrument of God therein, *viz.* the Gospell, holds forth the same universally to all no lesse effectually to them that reject it, then to them that embrace it. But that it is a mans faith and obedience begun and continued in untill the day of judgment, that makes this justification to be the justification of each singular person that is to be justifyed; and so Gods instrument of justification justifyes but conditionally; *i.e.* no one singular man actually and absolutely. It's man that by his faith and works makes Gods univ-

fall justification to be his proper justification and Gods conditionall justification to be his actually and absolutely. It is God that justifyeth all with a common and conditionall justification, but it is every mans task to make, and his own act when he hath made this justification to be really and undoubtedly his. Therefore he doth but gaze here to finde a moate in his brothers eies, fastening the beam in his own.

B. 3. *For (as* Aquinas*) the action of the Principall cause, and of the instrument is one action; and who dare say that faith is so Gods instrument?*

4. *The instrument must have influx to the producing of the effect by a proper causality; and who dare say that faith hath such an influx into our justification?*

I couple these two together because they are as twins that shew no malignity in their faces, but are by Mr. *Baxter* made to carry fire in their tails, *Who dares to say?* and *who dare say*? What if we should say it? must we expect a broken head from the Challenger? Is it but a word and a blow with him? Or doth he affright us with Gods judgments from saying it? is it his meaning, who hath so little fear or conscience towards God as to offend him and derogate from his glory in saying it? O that there had been but a moytie of the revereuce and conscience toward God, to annihilate man, and advance the glory of Gods grace, in Mr. *Baxter*, which aboundeth in many of those whom he here opposeth; he then surely would have cast this pernicious pamphlet of his into hell-fire, (if it had been possible) rather then published it to the nulling of Gods, and deifying of mans righteousnesse. But to the matter, we dare and that in the fear and presence of God to aver,

1. That the declaration of a man to his own conscience and evidencing to his soul that he is justifyed in Christ, to be the one and same action of God the principall cause and of faith the instrument. The declaration and manifestation of justification to the soul is here the action, God as the principall cause doth it by faith his evidence and instrument; faith as the instrument and evidence doth it from God as the principall cause, in manner before expressed. God healed *Naaman* of his Leprosie by the water of *Jordan* as his instrument; did many wonders in *Egypt*, and in the Sea, and in the wilderneſse by *Moses* his Rod as his instrument; subverted the wals and Towers

of *Jericho* by the inſtrumentall ſubſerviency of mens voices and the ſound or winde of Rams horns and Trumpets: Chriſt gave ſight to the blind man by a plaiſter of clay applyed to his eyes. Will he not acknowledg all theſe wonders to be the actions both of God the principall cauſe, and of theſe ſo feeble inſtruments alſo? The deſpicableneſſe of the inſtruments and means do not ſpoyl God of, but viſibly attribute unto God the whole glory of his grace and power which in the uſe of more noble inſtruments would not appear ſo ſenſibly unto ſome apprehenſions; much more is the ſame action the action both of God and faith his inſtrument, and this without all ſeeming ground of contradiction, when we attribute not to faith any inſtrumentality under God to the working or effecting, but only to the declaring and evidencing to man his juſtification, before effected and compleated in God and in Chriſt.

And 2. That faith as Gods inſtrument hath influx (in its kinde) to produce this effect [the evidencing of mans juſtification to himſelf] by a proper cauſality. I mean not, Mr. *Baxter* I thinke means not by a cauſality that is naturally its own and proper to it: but by a proper cauſality which God hath given it in appointing and uſing it as his inſtrument to produce the effect. Will deny any this to be true of the forementioned inſtrnments? He that made them his inſtruments begat in them a cauſality, and power inſtrumentally by and under him to produce thoſe effects.

Indeed to Mr. *Baxter* in reſpect of his principles, that denies Juſtification as an immanent act in God conſtituting and accepting us righteous, and will have this to be done only by a temporaneous and tranſient act of God by the grace of the new Covenant, theſe aſſertions muſt ſeem to have ſome monſtrosity upon their faces, that faith ſhould be ſo the inſtrument of God in juſtifying or making us juſt. Yet ſuch as he can eaſily ſwallow, becauſe on the other ſide his juſtification is but an univerſall conditionall juſtification, *i. e.* a juſtification in a poſſibility, or impoſſibility, but not at all in being; and that faith ſhould be termed the conditionall inſtrument of God in producing a conditiouall juſtification? I ſee not why it ſhould ſet the man in a chafe, he puts the *dare* to it therefore (I ſuppoſe) to make it too hot for the ſwallowing of weak and fearfull Chriſtians. To them that know whoſoever are juſtifyed in themſelves, that

is

is, declared to be such within their own consciences, the same were justifyed in God in Christ from all eternity: so that faith is Gods instrument only to evidence them to themselves and in themselves justifyed, not to justifie them in Gods mind and will: (for there they are justifyed without instruments) there is nothing formidable, nor rough in these assertions.

The objection which he addes, by which he pretends we seek to evade, we own not, neither have we need in the defence of truth to seek evasions. Let him name some one of his [some] that have so objected a passive instrument of justification, or else leave us to conclude that the objection is of his own head; partly to take advantage thereby, yet further to take his pastime in his Logicall and Metaphysicall learning, which may possibly please him but never justifie or save him; and partly by shewing the weakness of the objection to gull his unwary reader with an opinion of the weakness of their cause, who are forced with such *Egyptian* reeds (for lack of better pillars) to sustain it. It is one of the Jesuits principles to fetch armes indifferently either from heaven or hell to storm the Church and truth of Christ, and to promote the holy mother harlot of *Rome*. But I am weary following him while he brings nothing but the *Socinians* right reason to be judge of the Mysterious doctrines of Christ; and fear whether it be answerable before God, to spend time in answering his babble with babble again; for the truth of Christ doth neither stand nor fall by what can be said for it or against it out of the principles or learning of abused *Aristotle*. Let Mr. *Baxter* call to minde what he hath read as elsewhere, so in his adored *Schibler* in the second book of his *Metaph. Cap.* 3. in his interserted oration, a little before the end of that book, *pa.* 211. (of the book printed at *Oxford*) concerning the sophister, convinced by an unlearned Confessour after his almost victorious disputes against all the Doctors of the *Nicene* councell many dayes together: If he take it for a truth, it may help to convince him, that God is more effectually present in disputations about Evangelicall matters, when they are totally confined to the Word, then when they are handled after the rule and in the Predicament of carnall reason. It argues that he undertakes a businesse not for God, but against him, else would he not cast away spirituall and take up fleshly arms to maintain it. But sith Mr. *Baxter* is Mr. *Baxter*, we shall crave leave to speak the lesse to him henceforth where we find him

to have little of the word, and reserve our selves to speak more largely where the man for his recreation vouchsafeth to abase himself so low as to meddle with Scriptures.

B. Quest. *But though faith be not the instrument of justification, may it not be called the instrument of receiving Christ who justifyeth us?*

Ans. *I do not so much stick at this speech as at the former: yet is it no proper or fit expression neither. For*

1. *The act of faith (which is it that justifyeth) is our actual receiving of Christ, and therefore cannot be the instrument of receiving. To say, our receiving is the instrument of our receiving, is a hard saying.*

2. *And the seed or habit of faith cannot fitly be called an instrument. For*

1. *The sanctifyed faculty it self cannot be the souls instrument, it being the soul it self: and not any thing really distinct from the soul, (nor really distinct from each other, as* Scotus, *Dr.* Orbellus, Scaliger, *&c. Dr.* Jackson, *Mr.* Pemble *think, and Mr.* Ball *questions.)*

2. *The holiness of the faculties is not their instrument. For*

1. *It is nothing but themselves rectifyed, and not a being so distinct as may be called their instrument.*

2. *Who ever calleth habits or dispositions the souls instrument? The aptitude of a cause to produce its effect, cannot be called the instrument of it: You may as well call a mans life his instrument of acting, or the sharpness of a knife the knives instrument, as to call our holiness or habituall faith the instrument of receiving Christ.*

I have before expressed in what sense we make or at least hold faith to be mans instrument in applying Justification to himself. And 2. have manifested the testimonies and authority of the Scripture herein; so that Mr. *Baxter* if he list (as it listeth him) to cavill, cavils not so much against all godly Protestant writers whom he opposeth, as against the holy Ghost, speaking by the mouth of Christ himself, and his Apostles, whom thorow the loins of those he smites at. It is not the first time that he hath accused Christ and the holy Ghost in this manner of impropriety and unfitness of expressions in Scriptures. And why? because they speak not enough logically, and in all probability never read thorow *Aristotles Metaphysicks*. But let us hear what he can say

here

re to prove the unproperneſſe of that language which calleth ith an inſtrument of receiving Chriſt and juſtification in d by him. His reaſons are above in his own words ren-ered.

To the firſt I anſwer, Mr. *Baxter* makes and layes his own inciples of Religion, and from them, as from an impreg-ble mount he battereth Chriſt and his doctrine. Should we ant him that faith is the receiving of Chriſt, yet

1. How ſhall it appear otherwiſe then by Mr. *Baxters* own agiſteriall dictates, that juſtifying faith is nothing elſe but the eiving of Chriſt?

2. Why elſe doth he make it ſimply and only a quality or act the ſoul without the adjection of its originall from above, t to ingenerate into the minds of men an opinion that it hath emanancy and riſe from nature, from freewill, that every man y have and act it, if, and when he will; and that it is not infuſed God to be inſtrumentall by his appointment for the producing any ſpirituall effect?

3. How doth he prove that onely the act of faith juſti-eth? Yet

4. If all theſe dubious things were granted to him, his own rds therein tend to the confirmation rather then the infirm-of the main concluſion which he oppoſeth that faith is inſtrument of juſtification. For if the act of faith be the eiving, then muſt faith it ſelf ſo acting be the receptrix, that by which we receive Chriſt: but that by which n receiveth Chriſt is inſtrumentall to his receiving of juſti-ation; for Chriſt is made of God to us righteouſneſſe, he t hath Chriſt hath life; ſpecially this will follow upon r. *Baxters* principle of Chriſt and juſtification given to all iverſally, to none in particular; he muſt be made ours there-e by receiving him; and if faith doth receive, how doth it eive but as an inſtrument? or whereas the well is deep, and have nothing of our own to draw with, what ſhall be the rument of drawing and receiving if faith be not it?

5. And in this lyeth Mr. *Baxters* Sophiſm, that he es the act of faith for faith actuated. Though the act faith were the receiving of Chriſt, yet faith actuated acting is that by which we receive Chriſt, and to ſay t by which we receive is the inſtrument of our receiving

is not a hard but a proper saying. The act of Mr. Baxters ha was the writing of these lines. To say that his writing was instrument of his writing is a hard saying; but to say his ha acted in writing was his instrument of writing it is not a h saying.

To the second. It is wholly Sophisticall. For when faith,

1. The sanctifyed faculty it self cannot be the souls instrume because it is the soul it self: what is this to the purpose? Whe fore puts he the soul for the man, but to cheat in stead of in ming his reader? If any say faith is the instrument of the so he speaks by a Synecdoche, putting the part, the chief effici part of man for the whole man, after the common use of Scriptures; and why may not the severall faculties of the s be as well mans instruments as the severall members of the bo It is not unproper to call the eye the instrument by which m seeth; or his ear the instrument of hearing; or the the tong of speaking; or the hand of working, &c. and why sho it be then unproper to call the faculties of the soul the inst ments of man to act those offices by each faculty to which e faculty is appropriated? Or when faith is infused into the so doth it disinstrument the faculties thereof, that they become more instrumentall to man in their places? Nay it makes th instrumentall to work henceforth upon spirituall, as be upon naturall and morall objects. And this also answereth second reason why the habit of faith cannot fitly be called a instrument; because (saith he) the holinesse of the faculti not their instrument. I grant it, but this is not the ques That which he was to disprove is, that faith makes not the fac ties of the soul into which it is infused, instrumentall to applying of Christ to justification. The Compasse is the M riners instrument by which to steer his ship, yet would it nothing instrumentall to this purpose were it not touched w the Loadstone, that points it to the North-pole; so are the w and understanding instrumentall to the receiving of Christ a justification in and by him: not by any innate power in the selves, but as they are touched and pointed directly by faith, the bloud of Christ for justification; as to the doctrine Christ for illumination, and to the Spirit of Christ for sanc cation. And for this cause we call not so much the faculty

soul the instrument, as faith, because faith makes it instrumentall to justification. The power and disposition which it hath to this act being not naturall from it self, but supernaturall from faith infused into it, and working on it. In stead of answering in order to every particle of what he addeth, it shall suffice to discover his Sophistry by which he seeketh to elude a cleared truth of the Gospell, in all that he saith upon this argument, and this will be enough in answer to all that he saith, yea manifest him *unworthy of an answer*. As before he first taketh all the instrumentality or causality (whether proper or improper) of faith to consist in the act of faith, or faith as acted; as if the Chirurgeons instruments were not his instruments while they lie by him, but then only while he actually useth them in the severall offices to which they are appointed; and faith were no longer an instrument (if an instrument) of justification, then while it is actually receiving Christ, so the same man should be justifyed and unjustifyed oft in the same day, in the same hour, being no longer justifyed then while faith is in the act of applying Christ. And

3. In contracting the whole man, yea Christian into a soul as he did make such a faculty of the soul the souls and not the soul instrument to receive Christ, which himself knoweth to be the meaning of no one of them against whom he fighteth, but a slanderous and subtle trick of his own devising to make their doctrine seem absurd in an alien sense, which in their own sense he can in no wise confute. So

4. Here he further sophisticateth and perverteth their doctrine, in contracting the whole man (not only into a soul, which he had done before, but) into some one or two faculties of the soul into which faith is infused and inherent as in a subject, as if they taught that faith is the instrument of a faculty, and not mans instrument. The holinesse of the faculties is not their, *i. e.* the faculties instrument (saith he) but themselves rectifyed. The absurdities therefore which he inferreth as consequents of such an assertion are the consequents of his slander, not of their doctrine. None ever taught faith to be the instrument of a faculty, or instrumentall to justifie a faculty, but mans instrument and instrumentall to justifie man.

4. In

4. In ſuppoſing it as a thing granted that faith in the ſoul or faculties of the ſoul is nothing but the holineſſe of ſuch faculties, or their being rectifyed, and not a being diſtinct ſo diſtinct as may be called their inſtrument; a doctrine well agreeing with his principles who makes ſanctification the condition of juſtification, and no further attributes any thing to faith but as it is a part of our ſanctification *Pag.* 195. *n.* 5, 6. and thorowout this whole Treatiſe: but altogether denied by the Proteſtant Churches, which aſcribe not to faith any inſtrrumentality to juſtification, as it is a part of our holineſſe and rectitude; but as by a ſupernaturall vertue which it inſuſeth into the ſoul to carry it out to Chriſt, and God in Chriſt for remiſſion and reconciliation. Otherwiſe godlineſſe, hope, love, meekneſſe, and all other the fruits of the Spirit, ſhould juſtifie us equally with faith, becauſe the holineſſe and rectitude of the ſoul conſiſteth no leſſe in them then in faith. And this is the thing in queſtion, if we grant all is granted which the worſt of Jeſuites ſeeks, or Mr. Baxter in this whole book contends for; ſo that to make the whole thing in queſtion, a known and granted concluſion from which he will prove a particle in queſtion, is too groſſe an un-*Baxterlike* a Sophiſm; he is wont to ſpin finer webs, who make ſuch courſe threads in his fingers? And why ſaith he *Not ſo diſtinct*? is faith a being diſtinct from the faculty in which it is? Even this that it is a being diſtinct from the eſſence of man, ſpeaks it capable of an inſtrumentality in mans juſtification, eſpecially God having appointed and fitted it to that end; much more of being an inſtrument in generall for mans uſe, which is all that Mr. *Baxter* ſhould have denyed, when he denies it to be the faculties inſtrument.

5. In reiterating the ſoul for the whole man, and annexing captious words to it, *Who ever called habits or diſpoſitions the ſouls inſtruments*? Thus he playes the Sophiſter to make the inſtrumentality of faith ridiculous, as if we affirmed it inſtrumentall to juſtification *quatenus* as it is, and only in that reſpect becauſe it is a habit or diſpoſition of the ſoul; whereas contrariwiſe we aſcribe this power and office to it, as it is a virtue or gift of grace, endewed with this property from

the author of it to cleave to Christ, and draw forth the soul with it to Christ for justification, as hath been before expressed; and in this office it hath no other habit, power, or disposition of the soul naturall or infused, a corrivall with it.

6. He at last deals no lesse sophistically in his comparisons; *we may as well call* (saith he) *a mans life his instrument of acting, as the sharpnesse of a knife the knives instrument, as to call our holinesse or habituall faith the instrument of receiving Christ. The cause of a cause to produce its effect, cannot be called the instrument.*

There is no parity in the Comparison: Life to acting, and faith to receiving of Christ are not (Mr. *Baxter* will not say they are) in one and the same kinde and order of causes and effects. Besides, one of the effects is put with the other subtilely left without an object, as if the receiving of Christ were no more then, and altogether as naturall to man, as receiving indefinitely any naturall object; so that albeit this Comparison may stand in some parity with a naturall and civill faith without the object Christ annexed to it, yet the divine faith, whereof we hear speak, is of an another, an upper and higher region, and agrees not in motion with the naturall life, or with the naturall or civill faith. The one moves its course and operation in a way that God by nature hath prescribed, and the other in the way which God by grace hath prefixed. Their orbs are severed, and not confounded either with other. As for the other Comparison, the sharpnesse of the knife: Nothing else undoubtedly but the sharpnesse of M. *Baxters* wit could have devised it. Is then faith in man no more then sharpnesse in a knife? What good then might a ship-load of whet-stones and grinding-stones do among the *Turks* to make them Christians? The sharpnesse of the knife is not any thing really distinct from the knife; it is otherwise with the faith of a man. The knife is mans instrument, the sharpnesse thereof is but the aptitude of the instrument by which man as the efficient produceth the effect. How shall this square in the *Comparatum?* Man must be the principall efficient cause, what will he assigne to be the instrument whereof faith is the aptitude to produce the effect?

But I fear of transgressing by following him, that—*Pa vis componere magna solebat*: That dares with audacious arrogance to measure the bottomlesse ocean in his fist, and to try Celestiall and Spirituall things in the scales of Nature and to compare, not with the Apostle, *spirituall things with spirituall*, 1 *Cor.* 2. 13. but with carnall: profanely making the Mysteries of Christ to be rather the whetstone of his wit, then the object of his reverence and ballast of his conscience.

I shall forbear here to add my judgment concerning what faculty or faculties of the soul are the subject of faith. Whether faith may be more properly said to receive Christ by the faculty, or the faculty by faith? How far faith in the habit, and how far in the act may be said to justifie? These and other things may come more properly to be handled afterward then in this place. It shall suffice that here notwithstanding Mr. *Baxters* winnowings, yet faith faileth not from being our instrument of applying or receiving Christ.

Eightly, The latter which he maketh his sixth Question. Why he maketh faith the *Causa sine qua non*, he thus endeavours to maintain, as it followeth in the next Chapter.

Chap. XXVI.

Arg. Mr. Baxters *further dispute upon the same Subject, examined and answered.*

B. *Pag.* 223.

TO the 6. and last Question I answer, Faith is plainly and undeniably the condition of our justification. The whole tenour of the Gospell shewes that. And a condition is but a Causa sine qua non, *or a medium, or a necessary antecedent.*

Short and in compasse of words little is it which he here speaketh, yet if we look to the matter thereof in it two things are principally to be examined.

1. That he makes faith the condition of justification, and what he means by that term?

2. That he cals it the *Causa sine qua non.* He means (questionlesse) the same thing by both, but the words differ, and he useth both, as by both together, so by either part to get advantage to his cause. Therefore I shall examine them severally.

To the former I have spoke somewhat largely before in the examination of his 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 43, 44, & 45. *These*, as he gave me occasion in these severall positions to answer what he there asserted of conditionall justification. I have therefore here the lesse to speak, referring the reader to what hath been spoken before. Yea in this point I should be totally silent, because Mr. *Baxter* in words speaks no more here then what some of our most sound and godly Divines have spoken before him (that faith is the condition of justification) were it that Mr. *Baxter* meaneth as they mean. For though in the best meaning of the best men the propriety of the terms or phrase may be much questioned and give occasion of much dispute, yet traversing controversies about words, when there is agreement in the substance to which both parties drive, is in my apprehension a businesse so far tending to distractions and breach of union among the Saints, that it is the last and least Trade (I am confident) that ever will befall me to drive. But in this point though Mr. *Baxter* here speaks in words what some of ours have said, and do say still, and that without

any detriment (that I can see) to the Gospell: Yet his meaning and theirs are in no lesse antipathie then a Hawk and a Heron, and that as in other lesser, so principally in these particulars of moment.

1. By faith they mean our application, or faith as it is the instrument of applying Christ and the grace of God in Christ to our justification; he by faith means not only the act as a part of our inherent righteousnesse, but as a generall and common word that compriseth within it self all good qualifications and good works whatsoever, as elsewhere, so specially in and under his 70, & 71. *Theses* he declareth himself so that he makes and under the word Faith understandeth all these as equall conditions with faith of our justification.

2. By condition they mean that which being once attained and once fixed upon Christ, speaks us absolutely justifyed for ever. So that in calling faith the condition of justification, they mean we cannot be justifyed without it, but having once by faith apprehended Christ we are by it united and joyned to Christ and by force of our union with him are thenceforth absolutely and irrevocably pardoned and accepted as righteous in Gods sight. He cals it so a condition as that it continues still a condition, justifying us only conditionally and not absolutely, so that it leaves our estate still one and the same, no more justifyed and pardoned when beleevers then when unbeleevers. For by the satisfaction of Christ we are before faith come conditionally justifyed if we beleeve, and when faith is come we remain still but conditionally justifyed if we beleeve, our safety being as loose and uncertain then as before, depending still upon the residence and abode of faith in us as before it did upon the possibility of its future ingeneration into us and acting in us; and that we are no longer justifyed then while we beleeve and obey: so that by beleeving and unbeleeving, obeying and rebelling we may be justifyed and unjustifyed again a thousand times before we die, and how often after himself expresses not. I need not mention more, these two differences are enough to declare that although here he speak in the same tone with some of our Divines, yet his judgment no more agrees with theirs then the *Pope* with *Luther* and *Calvin*, *Elymas* with *Paul*, *Simon Magus* with *Peter*, or the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* with Christ.

In

In stead of speaking what might be further expected, I shall onely content my self here to lay open some of the many monstrous absurdities and mischiefs that follow this doctrine.

1. It proclaims mutability in God, and alteration in his minde and will, as swift and sudden as in mutable and sinfull man. For if God justifie and unjustifie, forgive and unforgive, love and hate, as oft as belief and unbelief, obedience and disobedience do nod and succeed either after other in man through infirmity, then is there no more stedfastnesse and consistency with himself, in God then in man: but rather God is swayed hither and thither in willing and nilling, love and hatred by influx from man, (as the Sea by the influx of the Moon) then man by influx from God. Mr. *Baxter* sees this absurdity, as well as his fellows the Arminians, and goes about here and there, by the Arminians *Sophisms* (for lack of better) to wipe off the stain: telling us that the change is in man the object, and not in God. God hates *Paul* unbelieving and persecuting, but loves him believing and obeying, the change is here in the object, not in God, *no more then the Sun is changed by the variety of the Creatures, which it enlighteneth and warmeth; or the glasse by the variety of faces, which it represents; or the eye by the variety of colours, which it beholdeth*, p. 174. But *Æthiopem dealbat*. If God love to salvation, and hate to damnation one and the same person, and love succeeds into the place of hatred, and hatred into the place of love, and God that erewhile willed the salvation, anon willeth the damnation, and after that again the salvation of the same man, (as this kinde of Anti-Gospellers assert) this is one and the same mutableness in God, whether it proceed from a principle of inconstancy within, or from the mutation of the object without him. It denies not the Chameleons that change their colour from white to black, and black to white, to be mutable, because these changes befall them from outward objects the divers colours of Carpets on which they are laid. Or if he shall object (as do the Arminians) *Here is no shew of change in God*, for God changeth not his purpose of saving, because he had never but a conditionall purpose and will to save, *viz.* if man will beleeve and obey; and this conditionall intent remains in God still, together with a conditionall intent to hate and damn him if he perform not the conditions. I should answer him in the words

of our Divines in answer to the Arminians; and Mr. Baxter knows them to be beaten with shame out of this plea, therefore to decline the strokes, I finde him not yet adventuring to make use of this objection.

2. It denies (in effect and substance) the justification and remission of any man in this life, for to forgive upon such a condition, as no man hath power in himself to perform, is but a verball; not a reall forgivenesse. And Mr. *Baxter* will not let one *gry* or *iote* from his lips that shall give hope to the sinner, yet to the believer of any dram of grace and power, that the Lord will minister to the Elect more then to the reprobates for the supportation of their Faith: and from themselves they have a propensivenesse to fall, and no strength to stand. In this respect therefore he makes the state of beleevers worse then the state of unbeleevers. For *Miserrimum est fuisse beatos*, To have had Faith, yea Christ in hand, and Heaven in hope, and then to fall from all, makes their case more miserable, in the losse of it, then it would have been if they had never had any thing in hand or in hope.

It utterly destroyeth all joy in beleeving, all peace of Conscience, all consolation in the holy Ghost, while it sets the beleever in the arms of Christs love, and participation of his merits and benefits; as *Dionysius* placed *Damocles* at his table with all sumptuous provisions before him, Musick, attendance, and whatsoever else was Majestical or delightful to cheer him; but with a sharp sword hanging by a single hair over his head threatning him. No other (after Mr. *Baxter*) is the state of a beleever, in all his most spiritual enlargements and comforts in Christ, there but a single hair between him and hell fire. Death is in the pot to all his contentments. Fear of imminent vengeance gives him no leave to taste one of the sweet morsels upon, or crums that fall from Gods table. And this is a Gospel from hell, contrary to the everlasting Gospel which Christ brought from heaven, giving *a joy that none shall take from beleevers, Joh* 16. 22. The foundation thereof, the love of God in Christ, remaining immutable, incomprehensible; *I am perswaded that neither death nor life, nor angels nor principalities*, &c. *shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord, Rom* 8. 38, 39.

4. Whereas there are three acts considerable about our justification

cation, 1. Christs giving; 2. Gods accepting the satisfaction given for us; and 3. Gods justifying or declaring, and evidencing us justified in and to our consciences, for this satisfaction so given and accepted; I would here demand of which of these Faith is a Condition. If he say of Christs giving satisfaction, this is a contradiction; for Christ gave satisfaction before we beleved or lived; so that Faith which came after could not be the Condition of an Act that went before, except he will say that Christ must so oft dye as sinners attain to beleeve: If of Gods acceptance, then more is ascribed to our faith then to Christs death for our justification, and faith shall be more then collateral with the sacrifice of Christ to our salvation, the sufficiency of satisfaction remaining only in Christs bloud, but the efficacy thereof arising from mans faith: yea and so Christ should have paid our debts, and spilt his bloud for us at the feet of the Father without knowing whether he would accept it or no, and so whether there should be the least fruit of his death (for the justification of the beleevers before his death is but conditionall untill the day of Judgement after Mr. *Baxter*, and what may fall out in touching the apostasie of their souls before that day is uncertain.) And it being not known of those that should come after him, who or whether any would beleeve and persevere in beleeving. If of Gods justifying us in our selves, *i. e.* declaring and evidencing us justified, we do in some cases acknowledge that God hides his face and evidenceth not his love in Christ in the same degree to all beleevers, but in God and in Christ they are still justified, and their salvation is sure. But Mr. *Baxter* shakes off this Act of Justification in disdain, therefore the absurdities which follow in his conditions in respect of one of the former cannot be avoided. I forbear to enlarge my self further in this kinde here having spoken to it before, and finding a necessity of speaking more afterward.

But it will be expected that Mr. *Baxters* Arguments be rather answered, then his conclusion denyed and opposed; let us therefore examine them; as far as I can finde they are in number two, by which he proveth faith to be the condition of justification.

1. It is plain and undenyable. This I acknowledge is a *Noli me tangere*, strikes dead in the place, renders the respondent as mute as a fish: Let a wiser man undertake, it is past my skill to answer.

2. The

2. The whole tenor of the Gospel shews that: specially [illegible] Scriptures as give their testimony of our justification in Ch[illegible] before faith entred to purifie our hearts: *When we were* [illegible] *strength, when sinners, when enemies, we were reconciled to God by* [illegible] *death, and justified by the bloud of his Son*, Rom. 5. 6, 8, 9, 10. *We were in our blood, polluted*, Ezek. 16. 6. *While yet unborn, and* [illegible] *done neither good nor evil*, Rom. 9. 11. 13. *When yet of the world,* [illegible] *not severed from the common masse of mankinde*, Joh. 3. 16. *God lo* [illegible] *us* to salvation, *While yet dead in sins and trespasses, he hath quic* [illegible] *and saved us by grace*, Ephes. 2. 5. *Blotting out the hand-writing* [illegible] *forgiving all our trespasses*, unto us in Christ while yet hanging [illegible] the Crosse, Col. 2. 13, 14, 15. making us *accepted in Christ* the [illegible] *loved*, Ephes. 1. 6. *putting away our sin and perfecting us for ever by the sacrifice and blood of Christ*, i. e. in Christ offering himself and [illegible] bloud in sacrifice, Heb. 9. 26. & 10. 14. and all this before [illegible] had a being who now live, much more before we were in a [illegible] pacity of having any condition in our selves of Justification. As also such Gospel Scriptures as affirm this remission, or justifica[illegible] tion unreversible, calling it an *eternal redemption*, Heb. 9. 12. *p* [illegible] *fecting of us for ever*, Heb. 10. 14. so that *there is no* more *condemna* [illegible] Rom 8. 1. *no more remembrance of iniquity*, Heb. 10. 17. *no more se* [illegible] *ration from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus*, Rom. 8. 39. [illegible] other many such testimonies before in part quoted, and part [illegible] remaining to be alleadged if occasion shall require; all which [illegible] concur in one Harmony to evince Justification once obtained [illegible] depend upon no conditions, but to be absolute and indefeasible [illegible] that if any fall away, it is because they only seemed, but [illegible] were in the number of the truly justified, 1 Joh. 2. 19. Who[illegible] ever layeth all these together, and will not be convinced th[illegible] Faith in Mr. *Baxters* sense is the condition of Justification, [illegible] will beleeve the Gospel it self more then what Mr. *Baxter* [illegible] eth of the Gospel; for any thing that I know, he may remain [illegible] Disciple of Christ, and unconvinced still.

In the Appendix, in the answer to the six and seven Queries or Objections, *pag.* 41. to the 46. Mr. *Baxter* makes it his [illegible] again to prove the justification of the New Covenant to be co[illegible] ditionall and not absolute. But so poorly doth he there hand his dispute, so unlike Mr. *Baxter*, who when Scripture fail him, is elsewhere wont to play his game with Sophi[illegible] (wh[illegible]

which here doth very little help him;) that unto a discreet man nothing can more breed a suspicion of the goodnesse of the cause, then the hard shifts, confusednesse, contradictions, and other weak devices and extravagancies, to which so accomplisht a scholar is put (even when he hath no opponent but a meer question) to make it seem probable. How doth the man put himself here into a wood or wilderneſse, seeking but finding no certain way out, acting his wit and study to the highest to expede himself in a cleer way that might be visible and plain to himself and others? and not finding it, he at last doth what may be done in such a labyrinth, trusteth to groping for what he cannot see. And first he seems to have found in the dark a two-fold Covenant of Grace, one absolute, and the other conditional. First then he follows the absolute Covenant, if that will or can lead him with certainty to any safety or shew of reason what to speak of it, as he makes it contradistinct to the Conditional Covenant, for justification; that the former which he cannot deny may stand as a cipher, but this be the Numeral, and only in power and force: else he is carryed in a maze of doubts and rovings, not finding where to pitch.

1. *Pag.* 41. *Sect.* the 42. he would shake off this absolute Justification as a Propheſie and promiſe made only to the Jews; not extending to us: but here the Apostle meets him in the way, Heb. 8, 8, 9. otherwise expounding the Scripture that holds it forth: so that this shift fails him.

2. He questions whether the Apostle mention it as an absolute promiſe, or else in an opposition to he knows not what; but fearing what would herein be answered, he lets fall this too, *pag.* 42.

3. He brings something which he thinks will hold water: that this absolute Covenant of Justification is made with the Elect, and not with mankinde in generall. What is this to the purpose? He is here treating of the New Covenant as it respects Justification. And in what one Scripture can he produce that Christ dies for all mankinde, and not of the Elect only justified? In this straight is the man, that in stead of distinctions, which were wont to be his Egyptian Reeds to rule our King, he is forced to use confusions for helps: for to be confounds together here the Propagation of Justification with Justification actually in being,

or with the being of it, when these are different. As well may he pronounce the rich glutton to be no lesse blessed in seeing that was *Lazarus* by being in *Abrahams* bosome, as to pronounce all mankinde justified, because Christ is conditionally offered to all for Justification. We have granted before the promulgation and offer of Justification by the Gospel to be conditionall, but the gift and beeing of it to be absolute. Neither is there any thing in this offer to our Justification in Christ, which is absolute before and without any promulgation or conditionall offer thereof to us. Nor anything to the justified and actually declared just in themselves: Justification is no longer in a conditionall offer to them, but in its absolute being within them. Whatsoever therefore he addeth there *pag.* 43, 44. is wide from the question, being not limited to the Justification of the New Covenant which is the subject of his Treatise, which here he shunneth and talketh extravagantly about sanctification, because he cannot confute the absolute justification, but that it doth and must stand, and standing will not admit a conditional justification to stand with it and by it, in its beeing, though the offer thereof (before it is in beeing) be conditionall.

And this is all which at length he concludeth *pag.* 45. of the conditionall Covenant of Grace, which without all this circumstation would have been granted him: *viz.* that it is propounded and offered to mankinde conditionally, if they will believe, and without this faith none hath or shall have the benefit and comfort thereof to themselves and in themselves, because all those that do not or shall not (being in a capacity to) believe are reprobates, and as many as are elect shall come to Christ and believe in him, as hath been before shewed.

What he addeth for the application may have some pertinency to the matter there objected, but it hath none to the thing now in question. Therefore I passe it by as not concerning us.

2. To his *Causa sine qua non*, briefly thus.

1. In so termining Faith he denyes faith to be any cause of our Justification, for that is but *Causa aequivoca*, or *causa non*, or *titulo tenus*, hath but the name not the nature of a cause, hath no causality upon, gives no influx into the effect.

2. Neither whatsoever it be doth Faith the *Causa sine qua non* of Justification, in that sense as Mr.

ther in his stricter or larger definition; except he will say that no infants are justified, who do not, cannot accept Christ, much lesse to beleeve as in his larger definition he sets forth faith.

3 Faith is not the *Causa sine qua non* of our justification in God, no nor yet in Christs Justification (as he tearms it) for these are antecedaneous to our faith, and our faith not an antecedent to it.

4 At the utmost it can be but the *Causa sine qua non* of Gods declaring and evidencing of our selves to our selves justified; and this justification Mr. *Baxter* so disdaineth and snuffs at, that he will not own it much lesse mention it. Yet can he not with all his Sophistry name any other act of justification in this life whereof faith can be proved to be the Antecedent, *Medium*, or *Causa sine qua non*.

5 Why doth he call faith and all the conqualifications wherewith he loadeth the shoulders thereof, and all the works which he makes its Concomitants, the *Causa sine qua non*, as if all these with their Colaterall in the other scale of his ballance, Christs satisfaction, did make up the one and sole *Causa sine qua non* of our justification; can none else be named? Besides other, the weakness and infirmity of the *Law to justifie*, as it removes the impediment of justifiableness in Gods Court of strict Justice: (*For had there been a Law given which could have given life, verily righteousnesse should have been by the Law*, Gal. 3. 21.) and sin which removes the same impediment, might more properly and socially then Christs satisfaction have been placed on horseback in the same saddle of *Causa sine qua non*, had not Mr. *Baxter* thought Christ would blesse, but these would have defiled this golden saddle of his own either making or appropriating to this use, and so bespattered and undressed the righteousnesse of his Qualifications and good works that they would never more become fit to ride on horseback in procession with the Holy Wafer. Thus his Condition and *Causa sine qua non* must be new modelled ere they will be Canonicall.

But see we here the mans wit which never fails him at a dead lift. What he cannot act by power he seeks to compasse by a stratagem. Because he cannot cover the nakednesse of his assertion, he labors to make bare ours, and cast filth in it, that having diverted the eyes of his Reader thither, he may forget the vanity of his Condition, or *Causa sine qua non*. And thus he doth it.

B. *Here by the way take notice that the same men, thus blame the advancing of Faith so high, as to be our true Gospel Righteousness*, Posit. 17 20. *and to be imputed in a proper sense*, Posit. 23. *yet when it comes to tryall, ascribe far more to faith, then these they blame: making it Gods instrument in justifying.*

In examining all these quoted *Theses*, I have shewed both who they are which blame him, or at least his doctrine, which was born before ever he commenced such a Doctor, *viz.* All the Orthodox Protestant Divines and Christians; and withall for what they blame it, *viz.* as it is *Papism, Socinianism*, and at the best *Arminianism*. 3. To which I have also made out their just grounds of blaming it, as may be there seen; yet to cheat his Reader, he cals these, those very men, as if there were some few contemptible Antinomians lately sprung up: when himself knows them to be all the Churches of Christ, which since the Reformation have been called Protestants. But of what blasphemy or evil fact doth he accuse them? *That they ascribe more to Faith then they blame, making it Gods instrument in justifying.* Yea but we have seen or thought we had seen (at least) just grounds for their so doing: how doth Mr. *Baxter* aggravate it to make it odious?

B. 1. *And so to have part of the honour of Gods own Act.*

Fie upon the *Hugonets* and *Lutherans!* if this be true, who then will not run from them at Mr. *Baxters* heels to *Rome?* But the Scriptures make *Balaams Asse Gods instrument to rebuke the madness of the Prophet*, *Numb.* 22. 28, 30. 2 *Pet.* 2. 15, 16. *The Ravens Instrument to feed* Elijah, 1 *King.* 17. 6. *The brazen Serpent his instrument of healing the Israelites bitten with firie Serpents*, *Job.* 3. 14. *Numb* 21. 9. *The Assyrians his instruments of chastising and reforming his people*, *Isa.* 10. 5. &c. *and the very Devil his instrument of trying* Job, *Jam.* 5. 12. and of *executing* his pleasure upon *Ahab*, 2 *King.* 22. 21, 22. Shall we now fall foul with the Scriptures, and accuse them that they ascribe part of the honour of Gods own acts to the Asse, the Raven, the Serpent, the Assyrians, the Devil, by affirming these to be the instruments by which God acted? Doth not the feebleness of the means and instruments speak out the whole honour of the action to pertain to the Lord? Was it to honour his slaves, and abase his freemen and subjects, the Lords *Host*, that *Solomon* made the former, not the latter his instruments in building

building the Temple? Mr. *Baxter* himself must conclude the contrary.

B. 2. *And that from a reason intrinsecall to faith it self.*

So acted the *Assyrians* and the Devill in the acts before mentioned, as instruments in Gods hand from a reason intrinsecall to themselves. Did this increase their honour? Rationall men in their actions make use of instruments that are fittest from an intrinsecall reason within themselves to produce the effect purposed. They seek not to speak with their ears, or hear with their eyes, or see with their heels, *&c.* because these have not a reason intrinsecall in them to such effects; doe they therefore ascribe honour to the tongue above other members, as the eyes or hands, *&c.* because they speak with the tongue and not with their eyes and hands? And do we ascribe to God or derogate from him, when we say he hath no lesse wisdom then a man, therefore useth, yea maketh instruments both within and without fitted for his work? when the Apostle affirmeth the *foolishnesse of* Preaching *Gods power to save, he robs God* of none of *his power* to ascribe either the foolishnesse of Preaching, or the Word preached, or the mortall Preacher thereof with Gods power.

B. *And from a reason that will make other graces to be instruments as well as faith. For love doth truly receive Christ also.*

1. *Qui alterum accusat probri, ipsum se inniteri oportet.* This trick he hath learned of *Potiphars* wife to accuse innocent *Joseph* of the fault whereof her self, not he, was guilty. Mr. *Baxter* indeed makes Faith and Love con-causes (of one and the same kinde) to Justification, *viz.* the severall parts that make up the body of Evangelicall Righteousnesse which he saith justifies us, *pag.* 236. *na.* 3. why doth he proclaim it a scandalous crime in us, which he fastens to himself as a praise?

2. We affirm not faith to be Gods instrument as it receiveth Christ, nor any further to be the instrument of Gods justifying, then of his declaring and evidencing us to our selves justified: We affirm it to be our instrument (yet as given us of God) as it receives Christ. Gods as by it he evidenceth life and righteousnesse to be ours; ours as by it we receive Christ and the justification, yea justifier in receiving Christ. And when that Mr. *Baxter* shall make it his task not only to say (as here) but also to prove that God hath qualified love for this Office, I shall

not doubt to undertake the task to answer him.

B 4. *And worst of all, from a reason which will make man to be the* Causa proxima *of his own justification. For man is the* Causa proxima *of beleeving and receiving Christ, and therefore not Christ but man is said to beleeve.*

Here is much of sound to astonish fools, but nothing of substance to satisfie the judicious; For

1. Did we hereby make man the *Causa proxima*, yet it is but the *Causa proxima instrumentalis passiva* of his Justification, the next instrument to apply it, and that not by any thing naturally his own, but by the new hand of Faith, which God hath given him to this end. And this obscures not but cleers up the Grace of God. Therefore by faith that it might [appear to] be by grace, *Rom.* 4. 16. The begger by receiving the freely given treasure may be properly called the *Causa proxima* of his enriching: yet hath the Benefactor that freely gave it, the entire praise of it.

2. Or if there were any damage herein done to the Grace of God, how much more guilty is Mr. *Baxter* of the fact, in making mans faith and works the very righteousnesse which giveth man right and title to Christ, and the Justification which is by Christ; yea a righteousnesse perfect and worthy as he hath expressed himself before in what we have already examined. Is not this to make Christs satisfaction the remote *Causa sine qua non* (as he cals it in this 56 *Thesis*) and man himself the *Causa proxima sine qua non*? and if the *Causa proxima* must in his judgement have the prehemінence, then in his judgement mans righteousnesse hath herein prehemінence above the righteousnesse of Christ.

3. Yea not only this but the very devill is the *Causa proxima sine qua non* of our justification (according to Mr. *Baxter*) and so must in this great businesse have the upper hand of Christ. For the Justification here is but a meer Embryo of Justification with him; which most times comes to nothing and naught. But Justification in the day of Judgement is the thing consummate and in its perfection, which (he tels us) is our acquitting from accusation and guilt, which shall be then pleaded and managed against us by Satan. Here he makes the Devils plea and managing of the Laws accusation, the next *Causa sine qua non*, upon which our finall and compleat justification

cation followeth. *Thes.* 39. *pag.* 188, 189. Where now is his *first of all*, in his or in our Doctrine? Thus while Mr. *Baxter* fights against us with a sword that hath neither edge nor point, he neither hurts us, nor provides for his own defence, but by brandishing his weapon untowardly, wounds his own face with the hilts.

B. *And yet these very men do send a Hue and Cry after the τὸ credere for robbing Christ of the glory of Justification, when we make it but a poor improper* Causa sine qua non.

Why *and yet?* All that he hath said against them is not against them but against himself: and for himself he hath said nothing. Only he hath entertained his Reader with a declamation against us, who expected his own assertion should have been confirmed, he hath by all laid never a Millstone, no nor a Cherrystone in the way to hinder the pursuits of the τὸ *Credere* at all for its sacrilege in robbing Christ. *When we* make it, *&c.* which *we*, with whom doth he side? For whom makes he to side with him, but *Socinus*, *Arminius*, and one or two possibly of their scholars among us; which have carried this and many other monsters in their belly long before they were delivered of them, and most probably have yet more behinde which have not yet seen the Sun. It is Mr. *Baxters* unhappinesse that these notwithstanding his wrestling and catching them by the heel, come to the light still before him. This is that (most likely) which stifles his Universall Redemption in the womb. But having nothing else to do to make him gracious at *Rome*, because he could not speak first, his care is to speak all bigger then they all that have spoken before him. Wee make it a poore improper *Causa sine qua non*: *i. e.* in true and plain *English*, a poor *perfect inherent righteousnesse*, *a collaterall of and no lesse necessary then the righteousnesse of the Lord Christ*, as in this 56, and before in and under his 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, and 26 *Theses* he hath enough manifested himself.

B. *Some think that Faith may be some small, low and impulsive cause: but I will not give it so much: though if it be made a Procatarctick objective cause, I will not contend.*

If

If he mean any other difference between the impulsive, and the Procatartick objective cause, besides that which is between the Generall and the Speciall, it is past my skill to understand him, or to comprehend what he denies and what he grants; no doubt either he would not be understood, or else he attributes to his righteousnesse of faith and good works an excitation (but not an impulsion forsooth) of the Grace of God actually to justifie those whom he beholdeth fairly dressed therewith, and so the beauty of the object enamois God to love and justifie. And what more doe the Papists teach? and so our justification as Gods act is but *posse* till our righteousnesse as a sufficient cause brings it into *esse* or act.

Schibl. Metaph. li. 1. ca. 44. N. 24, 25, 40.

Thus far of Mr. *Baxters* causes of Justification, in which if he hath illustrated or confirmed any truth of God, God is much beholden to him and *Aristotle* for it. For distrusting the succour of the Scriptures, he hath left them, and brought nothing else but Logical and Metaphysical notions and reasons to prove all that which he hath said.

CHAP.

Chap. XXVII.

Arg. Whether the sinner be justifyed only by the act, not the habit of faith? And whether it be not ordained to this use by reason of the usefull property which God hath infused into it, to receive Christ? Whether and in what sense a man may be said [properly] to be justifyed by faith? In which also some things are intermixed about Mr. Baxters τὸ Credere, *and conditions of Justification.*

B. Thes. 57.

IT is the act of faith which justifyeth men at age, and not the habit: yet not as it is a good work, or as it hath in it self any excellency above other graces: but

1. *In the neerest sense directly and properly as it is [the fulfilling of the condition of the new Covenant.]*

2. *In the remote and more improper sense, as it is [the receiving of Christ and his satisfactory righteousnesse.*

It is not for nothing that Mr. *Baxter* puts here a restriction upon justification by the Act of faith, limiting it to [*men of age:*] Are then elect infants that die before they attain age and strength of reason to put forth their faith into act, justifyed only by the habit of faith? It seemeth then that the hue and crie hath apprehended the τὸ *credere*, as to them, and laid it fast from justifying them. Again, if they are justifyed by the habit of faith as a habit of inherent grace, (though not such as he here denyeth to have an excellency above other graces) what difference doth he put between Justification and Sanctification? Doth he not speak the same things here with the Papists? Yea in a higher dialect then any of them? For they grant to Infants justification only by the washing of Christs bloud conferred upon them in Baptism, without any qualification of their own. But this man (if he thus say) justifies them by an inherent righteousnesse of their own. But if Infants are justifyed without the

act of faith, and yet not by its habit, how are they then justifyed but by that which he calleth *Christs own justification as a publick person at his resurrection?* which notwithstanding he utterly denyed *Thes.* 42. and its Explication: and if they are so justifyed, will it not follow then that justification by the act of faith is Gods declaring and mans applying of his justification to his present comfort and full assurance? (which Mr. Baxter explodeth as an unsufferable conclusion.) But dying Infants are to have no use of this present comfort and full assurance, therefore it sufficeth them to be justifyed in Christ, though not in themselves. Lastly, or do they depart hence unjustifyed, because without actuall beleeving and receiving of Christ, and so shall be justifyed in the day of judgment, because at the resurrection they shall actually beleeve? What a crie do the poor souls in the interim then make in that *Limbus infantum?* And why may not then (according to *Origen*) all the Devils and reprobates in hell be then justifyed and saved also, because then they may actually beleeve, and (according to Mr. *Baxter*) the condition of justification lasteth until that day.

B. Explication,

That faith doth not properly justifie through any excellency that it hath above other graces, or any more usefull property, may appear thus:

To the excellency of faith above other graces I have nothing to say. But to the reasons which he brings to deny the more usefull property of it, I shall speak briefly.

B. 1. *Then the praise would be due to faith.*

No more then when God gives us meat, the praise of our nutriment and life is due to our teeth, because they have a more usefull property to grind and chew the meat, then our eyes or ears.

B. 2. *Then love would contend for a share if not a priority.*

This is only said and not proved, or declared upon what grounds love should contend.

B. 3. *Then faith would justifie though it had not been made the condition of the Covenant.*

1. We

1. We denie faith to be the condition of the Covenant in Mr. *Baxters* sense. If he would have spoken directly to them against whom he argueth, he should have said, *Then faith would have justifyed though it had never been appointed and given of God as an instrument to receive Christ the justifyer.* And then we should answer,

2. That it is so much as if he had said, Then our teeth would have nourished and preserved life, although God had never appointed and given them to us as instruments to chew the nourishing meat. And thus the Caveat that he addeth becomes useless, *viz.*

B. *Let those therefore take heed, that make faith to justifie, meerly because it apprehendeth Christ; which is its naturall essentiall propertie.*

For none affirmes faith to justifie meerly because it apprehendeth Christ, without considering also Gods ordering and fitting it to this office, together with his promise, and the virtue laid up in Christ to justifie all that do by faith so apprehend him.

B. *That it is faith in a proper sense that is said to justifie, and not Christs righteousnesse onely, which it receiveth, may appear thus,*

1. *From a necessity of a twofold righteousnesse, which I have before proved, in reference to the twofold Covenant.*

2. *From the plain and constant phrase of Scripture, which saith, he that beleeveth shall be justifyed, and that we are justifyed by faith; and that faith is imputed for righteousnesse. It had been as easie for the holy Ghost to have said, that Christ only is imputed, or his righteousnesse only, or Christ only justifyeth, &c. if he had so meant. He is the most excusable in an errour, that is led into it by the constant expresse phrase of Scripture.*

3. *From the nature of the thing. For the effect is ascribed to the severall causes (though not alike) and in some sort to the conditions, especially me thinks they that would have faith to be the instrument of justification, should not deny that we are properly justifyed by faith as by an instrument. For it is as proper a speech to say* [our hands or our teeth feed us,] *as to say* [our meat feedeth us.]

I ſhall not have need to ſpeak much to this paſſage, becauſe Mr. *Baxter* hath before ſaid and I have anſwered to the greateſt part of it in examining his 23. *Theſ.* with the explication thereof. Here as there I ſhall defend againſt him, that it is not faith as it is righteouſneſſe, but Chriſts righteouſneſſe by which we are ſaid to be juſtifyed.

The firſt reaſon which he brings to evince the contradictory and contrary concluſion, hath been there examined, and I will not here *actum agere*.

To the ſecond, 1. He ſhould have quoted that Apocryphal Scripture which ſaith, *He that beleeveth* ſhall be *juſtifyed* (as if he were not already juſtifyed:) I finde it not in the Canonicall.

2. Thoſe Scriptures which ſay we are juſtifyed by faith, ſay not that we are juſtifyed by it as it is our righteouſneſſe, or any part of our juſtifying righteouſneſſe; and thoſe that ſay it is imputed to us (as Mr. *Baxter* will have it) *for righteouſneſſe*, have been ſufficiently ſpoken to under *Theſis* 23. And by the way Mr. *Baxter* is not ignorant that the originall text may be more properly rendred *unto* or *to* righteouſneſſe then *for righteouſneſſe*, and that the old tranſlation and moſt of our Proteſtant Divines ſo render it, neither have I met with any one that declares his diſſike of that verſion. And from the text ſo read what Mr. *Baxter* can ſuck out to ſtabliſh the righteouſneſſe of faith not as the ſame but as a collaterall with the righteouſneſſe of Chriſts ſatisfaction to juſtification, I underſtand not.

3. To his Only, only, and only, I anſwer,

1 That it is not the firſt time that Mr. *Baxter* hath taken the boldneſſe to teach the holy Ghoſt to ſpeak properly and fully.

2 When the holy Ghoſt ſaith, *That the bloud of Chriſt cleanſeth from all ſin*, 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. that *whoſoever is waſhed* [therein] *needs no other waſhing*, *Joh.* 13. 10. that he is the *Lamb of God that taketh away the ſins of the world*, *Joh.* 1. 29. *that by his one offering he hath for ever perfected them that are ſanctifyed, by taking away their ſins and iniquities*, *Heb.* 10. 14, 17. *That he is made of God righteouſneſſe to us*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. that *he was made ſin for us, that we might become the righteouſneſſe of God in him*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. That he

is all in all, Col. 3. 11. Will Mr. *Baxter* elude all theſe and a whole century more of the like Scriptures with this evaſion; yea Chriſt hath done, and is all this in part to us, leaving the other part of righteouſneſſe not perfected by him to be ſupplyed by faith his collaterall to our juſtification? Or when it is ſaid, *There is ſalvation in no other, nor any name elſe given us under heaven by which we may be ſaved* beſides Chriſt, *Act.* 4. 12. and the Apoſtle profeſſeth it his whole labour *to be found in Chriſt, not having his own righteouſneſſe which is of the Law, but the righteouſneſſe which is through the faith of Chriſt, the righteouſneſſe which is of God by faith*; ſo making Chriſt put on for righteouſneſſe, the righteouſneſſe which is through the faith of Chriſt, the righteouſneſſe which is of God by faith, not ſeverall kinds of righteouſneſſe, but one and the ſame righteouſneſſe which he oppoſeth there to his own inherent righteouſneſſe which he excludeth: are not theſe ſpeeches equipollent to that which Mr. *Baxter* requireth, the Chriſt only, or the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt only? It is but a flouriſh wherewith he concludes this argument, about the conſtant expreſſe phraſe of Scripture. For let him either produce one Scripture that affirmeth faith by any inherent righteouſneſſe in it ſelf, or of her own conveyed into us to contribute ſomewhat to our Juſtification, or elſe confeſſe his errour to be derived from the ſcriblings of *Bellarmine*, *Socinus*, *Grotius*, and *Arminius*, where this Doctrine is to be found, and not from the Scriptures of Gods inſpiration that are wholly againſt it.

To his third reaſon I can ſay nothing becauſe I underſtand nothing of his meaning therein; or if I doe underſtand it, nothing needs to be ſaid, becauſe it hath nothing for himſelf or againſt us. But to that which he addes of his thinking.

1. Let him ſay whether by them that (he ſaith) would have faith to be the inſtrument, *&c.* he doth not mean all the Proteſtant Churches, both *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians* or *Calviniſts*, as they are by ſome diſtinguiſhed: whether the beſt that have oppoſed them herein have not been the *Arminians*, and from what *Rome* or *Hell* theſe firſt drank in their opinion, he is not ignorant having fiſhed in the ſame pools after them.

2. When *he thinks* theſe ſhould not *deny that we are properly juſtifyed by faith as an inſtrument*: I anſwer,

1 If they will not deny it, will Mr. *Baxter* with them confeſſe it?

2 The word [properly] is *vox æquivoca*; a phraſe may be ſaid to be proper, as it is enough fit and proportioned to declare the meaning of the ſpeaker, and in this ſenſe we deny not that faith as an inſtrument ſubſervient to the principall efficient, doth ſo properly as an inſtrument can, juſtifie us in our ſelves or to our own conſciences.

Again, it may be ſaid to be proper in oppoſition to a tropicall way of ſpeaking: and in this ſenſe we cannot ſay that faith doth ſo properly juſtifie, ſpecially in that extent wherein Mr. *Baxter* and his Maſters will have it to juſtifie, without a trope in the phraſe of ſpeaking, which I would ſhew if it were pertinent to the queſtion.

I ſhall ſpare to tranſcribe at large his next ſection which he puts under *n.* 4. of his Explication. Becauſe if he meant ſingly and preciſely as he ſpeaks, all might be granted in a poſitive ſenſe without prejudice to our cauſe or advantage to his; *viz.* that faith doth directly and properly juſtifie in and to themſelves thoſe that were before juſtifyed in Chriſt, as it is (in a good ſenſe) the condition of the new Covenant, and a meane or inſtrument of Gods ſtamping by his commandement and promiſe to the attainment of this juſtification. For this denyeth not that truth which before he kicked at, that faith doth ſo juſtifie alſo in regard of that uſefull aud eſſentiall property which it hath above all other giſts of grace, to be inſtrumentall to apprehend Chriſt for righteouſneſſe. Nay even for this cauſe hath God either ordained and commanded faith to this end, becauſe it hath this property, or becauſe he hath ordained and given to it this property, therefore he not only requireth but alſo concurreth with it to bleſſe it, even it alone to this end. Here to determine peremptorily whether of theſe acts of God, his qualifying of faith for, or his commanding it to this uſe, is more and leſſe direct or proper to the end, or whether they are coordinates thereunto, I fear may proceed more from a headie raſhneſſe then from the modeſty of Chriſtian wiſdome; eſpecially becauſe I take juſtifying

ying faith to be more then a naturall or morall virtue, (which Mr. *Baxter* poſſibly will deny) *viz.* an infuſed habit qualifyed by Godhimſelf that infuſeth it with this peculiar property to cleave unto Chriſt and receive him.

But by the way it ſhall not be impertinent to ſhew in ſome particulars what mentall Reſervations Mr. *Baxter* hath in his words, not eaſily appearing to a curſory reader.

1. When he ſaith,

B. *Faith juſtifyeth, as it is the fulfilling of the condition of the new Covenant.*

His meaning is, that it only ſo far juſtifyeth as it fulfilleth the condition. But throughout our whole life, according to his principles, we are but fulfilling, have not fulfilled the condition of the new Covenant, therefore throughout our whole life we are but in juſtifying not juſtifyed. And then conſequently (if it be true what moſt of our Divines conclude) that in the next life there ſhall be no uſe of faith (becauſe viſion and fruition are proper to that ſtate) beleevers ſhall not be juſtifyed at all, becauſe the condition was never fulfilled.

2. When he ſaith,

B. *Becauſe God hath commanded no other means, nor promiſed juſtification to any other; therefore it is, that* [*faith*] *is the only condition, and ſo only thus juſtifyeth.*

The reader that doth but catch here a little and there a little of his doctrine, would think him by what he here findeth no leſſe Orthodox in the point of Juſtification then *Luther* or *Paul* himſelf: that he explodes all works, all inherent righteouſneſſe from bearing the leaſt part with faith unto juſtification: whereas contrariwiſe he ſpeaks not here of the faith of Gods ſtamping but of his own coining; of a faith that brings in all good works, that is it ſelf all good works to juſtification; attributes no more to faith then he doth to any other part of our inherent righteouſneſſe, nor any thing to faith it ſelf as uſefull to juſtifie, but as it is our whole inherent righteouſneſſe, or at leaſt a part of it: as partly by that which hath been, but principally by that part of his treatiſe which remains to be examined, appeareth. The reſt of this Section I let paſſe without examination.

I

I come now to the fift and laſt Section of his Explication, *pag.* 230.

B. 5. *That faiths receiving Chriſt and his righteouſneſſe is the remote and ſecondary and not the formall reaſon why it juſtifyeth, appeareth thus.*

We finde verifyed in Mr. *Baxter* that of the Poet, *Dolus an virtus quis inhoſte requirat?* having profeſſed open warre against the doctrine of all the Proteſtant Churches, yea of the Goſpell of Chriſt, he manageth it more by ſtratagems then by valour. We finde him here perverting in ſtead of rightly ſtating the queſtion, thereby to get advantage to anſwer what he will and to what he pleaſeth. The queſtion controverted between us and the Papiſts firſt, and in theſe latter times the Arminians alſo, is not whether Gods inſtituting of faith in Chriſt, or elſe the acting of faith ſo inſtituted, be the one the formall, and the other the remote reaſon why it juſtifyeth? But whether faith ſo inſtituted of God to be the mean or inſtrument of our Juſtification, doth juſtifie by vertue received from Chriſt its object, or elſe by its own vertue, as it is a good work, or as it is an act of righteouſneſſe performed in obedience to Gods commandement? That which they maintain is that faith juſtifyeth by vertue of its object Chriſt, denying the Papiſts work and the Arminians act. If Mr. *Baxter* did labour more for truth then for victory, we ſhould not finde in him ſo much fraud and ſo little of ſincerity. It is not Chriſts but Antichriſts kingdome that is maintained by the pillarage of ſhifts and ſophiſms. Let him not aſtoniſh the poor Saints of Christ with words that they cannot underſtand, obſcuring the truth with needleſſe terms of art; his poor flock of *Kederminſter*, for whom he affirmes himſelf to have compiled this work, are in all probability as well acquainted with the formall and remote reaſon why faith juſtifyeth, as they are with Hocus Pocus his Liegerdemain. In this point let him either conſute the aſſertion of our Divines, or maintain the adverſaries aſſertion; here he doth neither directly, but beats the aire and makes a great noiſe to little purpoſe. Yet let us ſee how well he proveth his own aſſertion.

B. *Suppose Christ had done all that he did for sinners, and they had beleeved in him thereupon without any Covenant promising Justification by this Faith, would this Faith have justified them? By what Law? or whence will they plead their Justification at the Bar of God?*

This supposition is not full, there must be another supposition antecedaneous to this supposition. A true supposition that will shew the invalidity of this feigned one. Suppose that upon a foregoing Covenant between the Father and him, Christ hath done all this for his elect whom he knoweth by name, and so Christ in their names hath given and God hath taken full satisfaction for all their offences, and hereupon Christ hath received in their behalf a full acquittance and discharge: Who now shall lay any thing to their charge? It is God that justifieth, *Rom.* 8. 33. under this supposition they are for ever freed from pleading at Gods Bar: *They have there an Advocate to plead for them, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the Propitiation for our sins,* 1 *Joh.* 2. 1, 2. *Sits at the right hand of God with the effectuall Oratory of his pretious blud making intercession for us,* *Rom.* 8. 34. so the supposition of Mr. *Baxter* extends no further then this, if without any Covenant promise of Justification by Faith in Christ, could they by beleeving in him have had the beeing and comfort of Justification within their own souls? Unlesse God had by some other way ratified and sealed this benefit to them, I acknowledge they could not: yet had their justification been still nothing the lesse firm before God in Christ. But now by the promise of the New Covenant, through Faith they have the sweetnesse and joy thereof in themselves also.

B. *But suppose Christ having done all that he did for us, that he should in framing the New Covenant have put in any other condition, and said* [*whosoever loveth God shall by vertue of my satisfaction be justified*] *would not this love have justified? No doubt of it. I conclude then thus: The receiving of Christ is as the silver of this coin, the Gospel promise is as the Kings stamp which maketh it currant for justifying. If God had seen it meet to have stamped any thing else, it would have passed currantly.*

We cannot so suppose, for one absurd supposition being granted a thousand more will follow after: Mr. *Baxter* be-

gins too low in his ſuppoſitions. Let him here advance a ſtair higher with us, and ſuppoſe firſt a truth, before he ſuppoſeth that which is falſe and unpoſſible in reſpect of that truth that muſt neceſſarily be preſuppoſed: *viz.* That God before his Covenanting with man had decreed within himſelf (*Salva Juſtitia*, without obſcuring at all his Juſtice) *to make known on the veſſels of mercy* (*i. e.* in juſtifying and ſaving miſerable ſinners whom he had before prepared to glory) *the riches of his glory*, *i. e.* the praiſe of the glory of grace, *Rom.* 9. 23. *Epheſ.* 1. 6. that himſelf and his free-grace ſhould be all, and man nothing to his juſtification and ſalvation; and to the end that his juſtice might appear ſtill in all its luſtre, had taken full ſatisfaction from his own Son: here to manifeſt the freeneſſe of his grace, the all to our happineſſe reſiding in his meer mercy, and the nothing in our ſelves, I ſee not what other condition or means beſides faith God could have put out of which mans proud heart would not have arrogated ſomething to himſelf to have ſwoln therewith, and ſo the glory of Gods grace, ſhould have been obſcured. Or doth Mr. *Baxter* ſee farther then the Apoſtle? He tels us, *It is of Faith that it might be by* Grace, *Rom.* 4. 16. If by other means it might have been, and yet by grace there would be a notable flaw in the Apoſtles arguing, which limits it to faith that it might be of grace. To the ſame purpoſe are thoſe many Scriptures in which he affirms it to be by faith that all mans boaſting may be excluded, implying that if it had not been only by faith, there would have been ſomething of man in it clowding the glory of Gods grace, and giving to man occaſion of boaſting that there is ſomething of his own to his juſtification, and ſo to glory partly in himſelf and not wholly in the Lord. So Mr. *Baxters* arguing, *If God had put ſome other condition, no doubt it would have juſtified*; is one and the ſame with this; *If God had acted againſt his own purpoſe, and betrayed the glory of his Grace, no doubt it had been betrayed.* But the former ſuppoſition is no leſſe abſurd then the latter. And almoſt ſo much at the full, Mr. *Baxter*, either to toll on his Reader into more ſnares which afterward he layeth, by his magnificent elogies of Gods grace, or from the throws and checks of an accuſing conſcience; ſpeaketh in the following part of this

this Section. Yet so that he cannot cease from the interweaving of mans works with Gods grace unto Justification: which because he doth more fully and grossely in the following part of this Tractate, I shall here forbear to anticipate what there is to be said by way of answer to him. The next Position is of neer cognation with this; his words are these:

B. *Thesis* 58.

The ground of this is; because Christs righteousnesse doth not justifie us properly and formally because we beleeve or receive it; but because it is ours in Law, by divine donation or imputation.

This is plain in it self, and in that which is said before. How this is plain in that which is said before, we have before examined; how it is plain in it self we are here to examine. To omit how after Mr. *Baxters* Principles the righteousnesse of Christ can be said to be ours by divine donation and imputation, when he holds it no otherwise by Gods donation ours, then the wilde Goose is his: his, if he can catch her, and as long as he can hold her: so his as it is every ones else as well as his if they can take and hold her. For she is the worlds Goose, and proper to no one before one hath taken her, and no longer that ones then while he holds her, if he let her go she is the worlds Goose again. If Mr. *Baxters* righteousnesse be stablished upon such a law, donation, and imputation, let it be his, not mine, I shall not contend with him for a share in it, because the Lord offers me a righteousnesse of *a better Covenant established upon better promises*, *Heb.* 8. 6. But to let this passe; When M. *Baxter* saith *the ground of this is*; *what meaneth he by this*? That no doubt that went before in the former Position. But in it are many things, and which of them is plain upon this ground in his meaning I cannot easily judge, because to my understanding no one of them is upon this ground plain. Nay upon this ground no man living is justified in this world. For it is not ours, saith he, by beleeving and receiving it, but by divine donation; And this donation he will not have to be confirmed, untill all the conditions be compleated, and that is not untill the world be ended. But to give my best conjecture of his meaning, I think he will be understood that the two last clauses of his former *Thesis* are plain upon this ground, *viz.* 1. That Faith

doth justifie: properly as a condition, *&c.* 2. Improperly as it doth receive Christ. The ground saith he is this, because, *&c.*

Here by the way we may take notice of the mans subtilty and sophistry, in shifting from one tearm of Art to another, *Thes.* 57. he tels us that faith doth [*properly*] justifie thus, and [*improperly*] thus; but in the Explication, he foysteth in the word *formally* and *formall*, *pag.* 230, 231. and here *Thes.* 58. puts both together, properly and formally, as if there were no other proper cause and reason but the formall cause and reason of a thing, and that every proper cause were the formall cause. And thus whatsoever Scripture saith illiterately, Christ himself after Mr. *Baxters* proper language, should not be a proper cause of our justification. And who sees not the end of this his project? If he be put to it, he layes a ground for the diverting of the whole dispute from the Scriptures, unto Philosophy, Logick, and the Metaphysicks, where there may be a cavill about the nature of the formall cause, so long untill both sides be out of breath, and in the end both parties be as wise to Justification as in the beginning. This is the calamity of the Church in these times, that they which hold themselves the chief Doctors and eminent lights thereof, darken every sacred truth with the mist of humane Learning cast upon it, in stead of clearing it to the comprehension of Gods babes and sucklings. No marvel then if the justice of God hath stirred up among us so many Earth-born and Earth-bred Meteors, persons of no learning, (Ranters and Enthusiasts I mean) like *Balaams* Asse to rebuke the madnesse of these Prophets. And doubtlesse either by these or some other the Lord will prevail against them, if they shall not cease to pervert with *Elymas* the plain ways of God.

Now to the matter it self about which his sophistry hath bin occupant. In these two Positions, *viz.* and 57, & 58. Mr. *Baxters* aym is at two assertions of the Protestants to smite them through, *viz.* the instrumentality of Faith, and the vertue which it deriveth from Christs it object, to justifie and to set up his τὸ *Credere* or act of beleeving under the name of a condition of the New Covenant without any respect of instrumentality that it hath to apprehend Christ, or any vertue that it receives from Christ apprehended.

ended to justifie. This he doth in the last words of the 7. *Thesis*, telling us that *faith* can be said only *in a remote and improper sense*, as it *receiveth Christ, to justifie*; where by receiving he shaketh and shifts off the instrumentality of faith, and by Christ the vertue of faiths object, into a remote and dirke corner as not working at all or very obscurely in our justification. But his act of beleeving he exalteth as the proper and formall reason of faiths justifying. This he illustrateth in the Explication *pa.* 230. Suppose Christ had put some other condition of the new Covenant, as Love, Patience, Temperance, Mercy, *&c.* that could not be instruments of receiving Christ, nor have Christ their object to draw vertue from him: should not either of these notwithstanding though neither instruments nor in a capacity to have Christ their object from which to have drawn vertue, by their own act have justifyed? So faith being the condition of the new Covenant doth by its act justifie. So argued he under *Thes.* 57.

But doubting of the validity of his reasons there either to weaken ours, or to stablish his own assertion, he addes this *Thesis* more fully to confirm what he had there endevoured.

The ground of this is (saith he) becaus, and becaus; as is before expressed.

I answer, there is no sufficient ground laid for the confuting of ours, or the strengthning of his tenent. For be it that Christs righteousnesse be ours by divine donation or imputation, how doth he build his opinion upon this ground, that the act of faith as being the condition, *&c.* doth properly justifie? He must shew his meaning in words at length and not in figures, before he shall win us to build with him straw and stubble upon the ground; that is good and fitted to bear a good structure. But very remarkably doth he here dispute in opposing Gods donation or giving, or our beleeving or receiving of Christs righteousnesse as if they could not both consist together in justifying us, at least properly. Then it seems

we are properly justifyed by the donation of Christ without his *credere* or act of faith. Yea then are we properly and formally justifyed in Christ before we yet beleeved: For he will not denie that Gods donation of Christ (at least in his sense) is before our receiving him. And thus with one breath he will throw down all that before with so much labour he hath built.

But let us see how from this ground he batters our assertions, and what force there is in his battery. If we look to the *Protheſis* of his *Theſis* alone, the argument in substance runs to this Tenour, Faith doth not justifie us either as an instrument, or by vertue of Christ; or Christs righteousnesse its object; because it doth not justifie us as an instrument or by vertue of its object. Who can shake his buildings that founds them on such firme ground? That this is the force of his reasoning is evident to them that observe him, that by the word [receiving] he excludes the instrumentality, and by [Christ] excludes the object of faith from any proper acting to justifie us, as I said before. But we will annex the *Antitheſis* to his *Protheſis* and so fill up his *Theſis*, and then see what strength there is in the whole to his advantage, or our disadvantage. What he must prove in his and refute on our part, hath been already declared. Only in the forecited *Protheſis* he begs the conclusion, that he should have proved. Therefore we must lay his whole argument from the donation or imputation alone: yet will we put his Argument full thus, If Christs righteousnesse doth not properly justifie us because we beleeve or receive it, but because it is ours in Law by Gods imputation or donation, then faith doth not justifie as an instrument or by vertue of Christ its object, but as it is an act containing the condition of the Covenant. But the former is true, therefore the latter also.

I deny the assumption as to the former member thereof the beleeving and receiving, &c. And Mr. *Baxter* brings not so much as a *gry* to prove it. And as to the latter member, Gods donation, &c. I deny the consequent of the

Majo

Major, Though Christs righteousnesse justifie us properly, because it is ours in Law by Gods donation or imputation, yet it followes not that either faith as an act or condition doth so of it self justifie, or that it doth not justifie as an instrument and by vertue of its object, or as some say, its correlate, or as others by the communion that it puts us into with Christ: this I prove thus, not from terms of art, but from the authority and testimonies of the most high God.

1. From the relation between the brazen Serpent the Type, and Christ Jesus the Antitype; *Joh.* 3. 14. The brazen Serpent was of Gods donation to *Israel*; so also was the Soveraigne power that was infused into it to heal; but the eyes of the wounded *Israelites* must be directed unto, and fixed upon the Serpent for cure, and then vertue issued from it to heal. So was the son of man lifted up with vertue in him to heal. Christ with this vertue is of Gods donation, yet this donation hinders not, but that our faith as an instrument must be directed to, and fixed upon him alone for justification, and so that justifying vertue or righteousnesse in him comes from him upon us to justification. It is no more the act of faith that of it self because a condition (if indeed a condition) doth it, then the act of the eye cured the wounded without vertue drawn by it from its object.

2. From the cure of the woman which had the bloudy issue, *Marke* 5. 25. it will not be denyed that the vertue by which she was healed was of divine donation, yet it was brought home to her not by the instrumentall service of her hand touching Christs garment; for the multitude touched his garments and thronged him, yet had no benefit by it, *verse* 31. But her faith apprehending Christ himself, so said the Lord, *Thy faith hath made thee whole*, *verse* 34. yet not the act of faith as a condition, but faith as an instrument by which the poor woman drew vertue from Christ its object, *Jesus perceived that vertue had gone out of him*, *verse* 34. So it was not the vertue

tue of the τὸ πιστεύειν or act of beleeving, but of Ch beleeved on, which wrought the cure: such are the o rations of Christ and faith in the cure of the soul as h in the cure of the body.

3. From 1 *Cor.* 30. 31. *Christ* is of God made u us *Righteousnesse*, *viz.* to Justification, *That he which gl rieth may glory in the Lord.* God hath made him rig teousnesse, but how to us, or our righteousnesse tha may be of his donation to us? Mr. *Baxter* must answer, faith, else farewell his condition; but if by the act faith as our righteousnesse in fulfilling the conditio or otherwise then an instrument to apprehend the rig teousnesse of Christ to justification, then have we som what of our own righteousnesse wherein to glory, would not be the Lords that we might glory in h alone.

4. To this I might add also the phrase which t Apostle useth, that we are justifyed πὶ πίστει, διὰ τῆς πίσ by faith, through faith, as an instrument; and ne διὰ τὴν πίστιν, for our faith, or upon our faith as for a c or upon a condition fulfilled, as some of our Divines ha well observed.

I proceed to the next position.

B. Thesis 59.

Justification is not a Momentaneous act, begun a ended immediately upon our beleeving, but a cont act; which though it be in its kind compleat from first, yet it is still in doing till the finall justification in judgment day.

All this together with most of the Explicat may be granted as being capable of an Orthodo sense.

1. That justification as an act immanent in God such as is here described is confessed. But Mr. Bax deaf in this ear.

2. Th

2. That our justification in Christ is such (in some sense) we also grant, but neither will he listen to this.

3. Therefore if he would take off all ambiguity of his words, and declare his sense to be the same with the sound, we would grant to him also that such is our personall justification in our selves, which he owneth only for justification. For as it is an act of God it is never interrupted or dissolved till the day of judgement, though as it is taken Passively, there may be many interruptions of our sense and apprehension of it.

But his *Thesis* is faced like *Janus*, lookes two wayes at once, is set forth in such words as will more properly admit of an evill then a good sense. And that he speaks them after the Remonstrant, not the Protestant dialect, is too probable though not infallibly evident, from these reasons, to be meant in an evill sense.

1. Because he delivers it in the Arminian phrase. For so his St. *Episcopius*, *Justificatio est actus continuus qui est & durat, quamdiu durat ipsius conditionis requisitæ præsentia, interrumpitur vero semper & toties quoties actus præstantur ejusmodi qui cum vera fide & conscientia bona consistere nequeunt, i. e.* Justification is a continued act which is and dureth as long as the presence of its requisite condition continueth, but is interrupted so often as such acts are done which cannot consist with true faith and a good conscience. To the continuance of justification Mr. *Baxter* here speaketh the same thing with him, and though as to the interruption of it he speaks here as out of a cloud, yet compare with this his 45. *Thesis* and you will have the whole of *Episcopius* from the pen of Mr. *Baxter*. *Episcop. Disp. 22. Thes. 12. de Justif.*

2. Because his words do seem here to suppose a *Magis & minus* in its active acceptation or sense. *It is not begun and ended immediately*, saith he, but is still in doing [in a way of perfecting] untill the judgment day.

3. His restriction added to the compleatnesse or perfection thereof at the first. *It is compleat at first*, saith he but *in its kind*, which restriction makes the compleatnesse of justification incompleat, and its perfection imperfect till the day of judgment, as himselfe hath expressed himselfe before *Thesis* 41. These things from the position it self. From the explication will follow.

4. The heartlesse and comfortlesse proof that he brings to prove the continuance of this justifying act, making it to reach only to the *Genera singulorum*, not to the *singula generum*: to such a kinde of men, not to any singular man, or individuall person upon earth: to *Beleevers*, but not to this or that beleever. So that the holiest Saint if at any time his faith in some temptation faint, and cannot be brought to sensible acting, is left destitute of all comfort from the Gospell or new Covenant after Mr. *Baxters* principles. It justifieth onely so long as faith actually receiveth Christ; if faith through infirmity cease to act, he gives the distressed soul no comfort that God continueth to justifie.

5. From the first use of instruction which he draweth from this position. This *sheweth us* (saith he) in the first place, *with what limitation to receive the assertion of our Divines, that remission and justification, are* simul *and* semel, *performed*: his meaning is, that we must understand them in this assertion to deal as Mr. *Baxter* is wont, *viz.* to say one thing and mean another. Not to think as they speak, but to equivocate and retaine a mentall reservation within themselves. That our justification is begun and perfected both at once and together, but all this is but *suo genere*, in its kinde; that is, conditionally, even as the Usurer frankly and freely forgave to his debtor all that he owed him, but with this limitation that if he were not paid the whole debt to day, he would cast him in prison to morrow

w there to lie untill he ſhould pay the whole for-
iture.

But becauſe Mr. *Baxter* is diſpoſed here to liſp and not to
ak alowd and plain his minde, we ſhall leave him to his
mour, and proceed to hearken to him where he ſpeaketh
ainly and without parables.

3. His restriction added to the compleatnesse or perfection thereof at the first. *It is compleat at first*, saith he but *in its kind*, which restriction makes the compleatnesse of justification incompleat, and its perfection imperfect till the day of judgment, as himselfe hath expressed himselfe before *Thesis* 41. These things from the position it self. From the explication will follow.

4. The heartlesse and comfortlesse proof that he brings to prove the continuance of this justifying act, making it to reach only to the *Genera singulorum*, not to the *singula generum*: to such a kinde of men, not to any singular man, or individuall person upon earth: to *Beleevers*, but not to this or that beleever. So that the holiest Saint if at any time his faith in some temptation faint, and cannot be brought to sensible acting, is left destitute of all comfort from the Gospell or new Covenant after Mr. *Baxters* principles. It justifieth onely so long as faith actually receiveth Christ; if faith through infirmity cease to act, he gives the distressed soul no comfort that God continueth to justifie.

5. From the first use of instruction which he draweth from this position. This *sheweth us* (saith he) in the first place, *with what limitation to receive the assertion of our Divines, that remission and justification, are* simul *and* semel, *performed*: his meaning is, that we must understand them in this assertion to deal as Mr. *Baxter* is wont, *viz.* to say one thing and mean another. Not to think as they speak, but to equivocate and retaine a mentall reservation within themselves. That our justification is begun and perfected both at once and together, but all this is but *suo genere*, in its kinde; that is, conditionally, even as the Usurer frankly and freely forgave to his debtor all that he owed him, but with this limitation that if he were not paid the whole debt to day, he would cast him in prison to morrow

w there to lie untill he ſhould pay the whole for-
rare.

But becauſe Mr. *Baxter* is diſpoſed here to liſp and not to
ak alowd and plain his minde, we ſhall leave him to his
mour, and proceed to hearken to him where he ſpeaketh
inly and without parables.


15
61
MAY

Mr. *Baxters* APHORISMS Exorized and Anthorized:

OR,

An Examination of, and Answer to, a Book written by Mr. *Rich. Baxter* Teacher of the Church at *Kedermin*ſter in *Worceſterſhire*;

ENTITULED,

Aphoriſms of Juſtification.

THE SECOND PART.

CHAP. I.

The following Doctrine of Mr. Baxters *Book reduced to ſome few heads, and the queſtion between him and the Proteſtants about Juſtification by works ſtated.*

HItherto we have been buſied about the view of Mr. *Baxters* ſwelling, which the more and the farther we gazed on, the more it increaſed, and after a long expectation of an iſſue, at length the impoſthumated matter breaks out in the ſight of all men, to the offence of all ſpiritual men, *Juſtification by works*. This is the declared and profeſſed Subject of all the following part of this Treatiſe, what before he did but hint and whiſper in a kind of darkeneſſe, now

he preacheth on the top of the house, proclaiming it as the sole *Soul-saving* doctrine, canonizing as Saints the Papists for the constant holding forth of it, and Anathematizing all the Protestants Churches as Apostaticall for departing from it, as by examining what followes in this his Tractate will appear.

For the avoiding of confusion, and prevention of a voluminous prolixity, into which I see my self already carried by following him Thesis after Thesis, (being necessitated thereby as he speaks, so to examine and answer the same things often in many places;) I shall endeavour to reduce unto some few heads the sum of what he saith upon this Question, examining that which is to the purpose, and leaving the rest that is inconsiderable or impertinent to it.

1 Then I shall endeavour to draw out from him the state of the Question what he holdeth, and how he holds it forth to us.

2 I shall examine his Arguments and Reasons, by which he endeavoureth to confirme his assertion or assertions.

3 I shall also examine what force there is in the Reasons which he bringeth to clear himself and his doctrine from being derogatory to the grace of God and full efficacy of Christs mediation; or from all tainture of Popery, Socinianism, or other heresies. Within this Triangle I conceive the whole fabrick of his doctrine of workes to be comprehended; and in examining of these fully, nothing to be left unexamined, that may make for his purpose.

1 The state of the Question, or his assertions which he maintaineth, I shall (as neer as may fitly be done) transcribe from him in his own words: thus,

1 *The bare act of beleeving is not the only condition of the new Covenant but severall other duties also are part of this condition,* [*viz. of Justification*] (For this is his meaning, and if he be not so understood, he is understood besides his meaning, and in what he saith he saith nothing. His Tractate contains Aphorisms of Justification only. And the conditions of the new Covenant which tend to Illumination, Sanctification, Glorification, &c. must not be confounded with those of Justification; if it were granted him, that the Gospell dispenseth all or any of these upon conditions. In this sense therefore he must, he will be understood.) *Thes.* 60. *pa.* 235.

2 That

2 That these duties coordinate with Faith to our Justification as conditions thereof, are Repentance, praying for pardon, forgiving others, love, hearing the word, consideration, conviction, godly sorrow, knowledge of Christ, assent to the truth of the Gospell, subjection, consent, acceptance, cordiall covenanting, self-resigning, esteeming and preferring Christ before all, loving him above all, sincerity, perseverance, affiance, sincere obedience, and works of love, serious, painfull and constant use of Gods ordinances; hearing, praying, meditating; in a word, all good works, *i. e.* all the works of Righteousnesse, holinesse, mercy, &c. which the Law requireth: [yet with this proviso that all these legall workes must be called not our legall but our Gospell Righteousnesse.] *Thes.* 60. *p.* 235, 236, *&p.* 240, 241, 242. & *Thes.* 73, 74, *p.* 289. 290, 291, 292.

3 That the non-performance of any one of these doth hinder, but it is not one or many, but a concurrence of all these together in one, that sufficeth to condition us unto Justification, *Thes.* 61. So that when the promise of life is made in Scripture to our beleeving in Christ, or to any other inseparable concomitant of Faith, you must understand it *Ceteris paribus, viz.* that your knowledge, repentance, obedience, good workes, &c. are not an inch behind your faith; or in *sensu composito*, that it is a compounded Faith, hath all other vertues not only included in it, but also actuated, and cooperating with it for justification, or else you must be shaken off unjustified; yea though all the rest be in act and but one out of act, *Thes.* 61. and its Explication. He saith not this indeed *totidem verbis*, word by word: But let him deny the least particle of all this to be his meaning, he shall by such a denyall extremely wound, if not wholly subvert his cause, and yeeld it to us.

4 It is not the habit of these vertues as infused from above in us, but the act or work of them as set in operation by us, that justifieth. For so saith he of Faith it self (much more implieth it of the other vertues) that it is the act of faith alone, as it is our act or work that justifyeth, aad consequentially that we are justifyed wholly by works, *viz.* as the alone condition or *causa sine qua non.*

5 That some of these justifying vertues or works, are antecedaneous to, or fore-going preparatives of, some integrall parts, some proper, essentiall, formall acts, some differentiall and essen-

tiall parts, some modifications, some inseparable products, some both parts and necessary consequents, and subservient acts, some necessary continuing and exercising means, and lastly some separable adjuncts of Faith, yet tending to the well being thereof; and thus having adorned faith like the *Cornish* Chough with the feathers of all the best birds, he sends it to soar aloft with these plumes to heaven for justification, which without this borrowed help, of it self it was not in a capacity to do, *pa.* 240, 241, 242.

In these particulars I take the whole sum of his doctrine about this Question to be comprehended. He addeth indeed some lenitives here and there to mitigate and make tolerable the asperity and harshnesse of these his assertions, which we shall examine among the reasons that he brings to manifest his doctrine not to be derogatory from the glory of Gods grace, &c. as being more proper to that then this place. All the forementioned particulars may be summed up in this one, *That all the acts or works of all morall vertues, and of all infused Habits* (if he grant any such) *are required coordinately with faith to make up the condition, upon which we shall, and without which we cannot be justifyed.*

In opposition to this, all the Protestant Churches do and still have maintained that Faith alone, and the same not as it is in the consideration of a habit or vertue, or as an act of ours, but by way of a means or instrument (as hath been before explained) justifyeth, without any concurrence of works with it in the act and office of justifying. This assertion he endeavours to destroy, and establish his own, with many Arguments, which we shall examine severally either after other.

CHAP.

Chap. II.

Mr. Baxters *preface to his first Argument drawn from Scriptures to prove Justification by works, examined; and the Scriptures which the Protestant writers bring against it, and Mr.* Baxter *would have stifled in darknesse, here brought to light; together with the opinion of the most eminent Protestant writers upon this Subject.*

HIS first argument is drawn from Scriptures, unto which he thus prefaceth,

235. *I desire no more of those that deny this, but that Scripture may be judge: and that they will put by no one Text to that end produced, till they can give some other commodious, and not forced interpretation.*

We gladly accept this rule of dispute, and pronounce all other rules in Questions of this kinde to be irregular. Yet have we somewhat to say to the proposer of it.

1. Why hath he in the former part of this Tractate so much wandered from the rule of Scripture as insufficient or improper to try his opinions, and make use (in stead of it) of so much exotick learning, the Jesuits sophistry, and *Socinus* his right reason, as if the Scripture were not, but these were to be attended on as proper Judges in such matters?

2. When all the Scriptures which he here bringeth to prove a cooperation of workes with faith to justification (scarce any one of them excepted, as I undertake if he call me to it to shew) have been alleaged by the Monkes and Jesuits against us, and been answered over and over a hundred times by our Divines; why doth he here urge them as Scriptures of his own collection, and require an interpretation to be given to them that might manifest they hold not forth Justification by works? how doth he abase the Ministers his readers, for whose seducing he hath compiled this Book, by imprinting within himselfe

a ſuppoſition, that their Libraries conſiſt only of *Ariſtotle* and *Schibler*, and that they are as ignorant of the controverſie between the Papiſts and us, as they were born? Elſe if he ſuppoſed they had read ſuch controverſies, he would not have called for an interpretation of theſe Scriptures as now firſt alleaged by himſelfe. Simplicity in handling the truths of Chriſt is neceſſary to declare the heart upright. If Mr. *Baxter* had poſſeſſed ſuch a jewell within his boſome, he would have exploded all tricks of ſubtlety and craft with an *Anathema Maranatha*; and told us plainly, theſe Scriptures have been urged by the Papiſts for their juſtification by works, that the Proteſtants have ſaid ſomewhat to elude the force of ſuch Scriptures by forced interpretations of them, but againſt every interpretation of every ſuch Scripture, he thus and thus excepteth, and bids theſe exceptions of his to be anſwered, elſe he cannot be convinced but that works cooperate with faith to Juſtification. But in the midſt of a room that is hung with a thouſand candles and torches, to cry out, O that ſome one would give us one ſpark of light in this dark dungeon! this is no leſſe then to pronounce all ſave himſelfe within the room blind, that in the midſt of light they ſee nothing. Or otherwiſe to pronounce all theſe lights darkneſſe in compariſon of his more ſhining light. Let not Mr. *Baxter* ſo contemn all the *Antinomi* call worthies as ſmoaking ſnuffs in compariſon of his beames, nor think all his ſoak-fellowes in the Miniſtry at the preſent to be ſuch glow-wormes and ſlimy ſoes, that being thus ſprinkled with his baſe eſteem of them, they ſhould be inſenſible of it, and goe away rejoycing, as ſprinkled with his holy waters.

3 Why doth he only quote Scriptures and bring for him and againſt us only Arithmeticall figures and ciphers, without the words of theſe Scriptures, and telling us how they make for him & againſt us? would he have us to underſtand that he means to argue from them no otherwiſe then the Priests and Jeſuites have done before him? he might then anſwer all in a word by ſending him to thoſe pretious ſervants of Chriſt who have anſwered the Argumentations of theſe Prieſts and Jeſuites from theſe Scriptures. Ours it is to ſtraighten us with a doubtfulneſſe, what to anſwer, becauſe we know not how he will argue from theſe Scriptures, and to reſerve to himſelfe an advantage to except

against

against all our answers, that we have not spoken to the purpose, he meant not so, but thus and thus to have argued from these Testimonies. What better answer to such a roving disputer, then to leave him roving, untill he will cease from circling, and fall upon some point wherein he will declare himself that he would be answered? This I should do, had it been my only purpose to have answered Mr. *Baxter*; but because my aime was and is least to grapple with him, (from whom I expect nothing better but many things worse, after all wiser mens endeavours then mine, [and could shew reason for it]) but chiefly to preserve the single hearted Christians free from his infection; I shall not wholly passe by, without examination, these Scriptures, that none by the misunderstanding of Scriptures may be carryed into Anti-scripturall errors.

4 But how seasonable is the Caution that he gives us, to take heed of giving any uncommodious or forced interpretation to those Scriptures which the Papists, and after them the Socinians have urged for their justification by workes? As if all our Divines and Martyrs for Christ in these last 200. years have abused the Scriptures with false interpretations, and so have been Apostates from Christ in departing from *Rome*: and that the Jesuits and Socinians have been the only sincere interpreters of Scriptures: when contrariwise all that have but looked over the pale into their writings, find nothing so sacred, no Scripture so plain which they do not violate and distort with their Sophisticall cavillations. That Hell it self hath in no age vomited out any brood of hereticks that can parallell these in audacious abuse and violation of Scriptures; yet while Mr. *Baxter* fights with their Arguments and maintains their assertions, he cals upon us, *Take heed, abuse not Scriptures.*

5 Why doth he not produce first, (seeing he professeth himself a Protestant and Anti-papist) those manifold and cleer Scriptures which all the Protestant Churches alleage for stablishing of justification by faith alone, and the expelling of works from having any part with faith in this work, and answer their Arguments drawn from such Scriptures; before he brings in the Scriptures which the Jesuits have mustered up against their assertion? At least why doth he not declare as well what the Protestants have to say for themselves, as what the

Papists have to say against them, that both sides may be heard. But to make a roar on the one side, and to exhibit the other party as mute as fishes, having nothing to say, or reason to give for their own Religion, nor to gainsay the adversaries in opposing it; is this fair and Christian dealing? Thus to stifle our cause, or rather the cause of Christ in darkenesse, and to imprison the light by which we have walked from the time of *Luther* untill this day, what doth it argue in him lesse then what Christ tels us, *He that doeth evill hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds which are evill should be reproved?* Joh. 3. 20.

These things thus premised, let us come now to the Scripture, making it the Judge and touchstone in this Controversie: But so, as that it shall be requisite for me to supply what Mr. *Baxter* hath left untouched, what Scriptures our Divines bring to prove justification to be only by faith, and to deny all cooperation of works therein. And herein I shall put limits to my self not letting out all that they produce, (for so should I offend with immoderate length) but some particulars, that the weake reader may see, what Mr. *Baxter* would not give him to see, that our Churches are not destitute of strong grounds for the bearing up of their faith and assertions. And when this is done, I shall descend to examine the force of those Scriptures quoted by Mr. *Baxter*, to see whether they make for him and against us.

I shall begin from the reasoning of the Apostle *Rom.* 3. 10. *&c.* having before proved both the Jews by and under the Law, and the Gentiles without the Law, to be guilty before God; he concludes, *Therefore by the deeds of the Law, there shall no flesh be justified*, &c. and *ver.* 21. *The righteousnesse of God* [viz. to justification] *is manifested without the Law, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets* (*to wit*, a righteousnesse which the Law is ignorant of, the righteousnesse or life which is by faith. From this righteousnesse the tenour of the Law or legall Covenant turns aside, telling us, *he that doeth them shall live in them*, *Gal.* 3. 11. 12.) *ver.* 22. *Even the righteousnesse of God which is by the faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all that beleeve.* Lo here it is denyed to be by the most righteous works which the most perfect Law of God himself prescribeth, and attained by faith only, *ver.* 24. *Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption which*

by Jeſus Chriſt, what can be ſaid more fully? It ſhall not be impertinent to annote briefly out of *Zanchy*, what he hath upon this verſe more largly: when the Apoſtle ſaith we are juſtifyed by his grace, *Per Gratiam intelligit gratuitum Dei favorem, omnibus noſtris excluſis, ſive naturalibus, ſive ſupernaturalibus dignitatibus*, ſaith he; *i. e.* by Grace the Apoſtle meaneth the free love or favour of God, excluding all parts and pieces of our worth both naturall and ſupernaturall: and addeth, that the Apoſtle ſtill oppoſeth grace to all our works, and to all our inward vertues wrought in us by the holy Ghoſt himſelf, [as well as to our legall and morall righteouſneſſe] yea to faith it ſelfe as it is a work, as is manifeſt to every one that hath with any conſideration read this Epiſtle. Therefore ſaith he, he excludeth all works, that he may conclude our Juſtification to be by grace alone. Yea more, the Apoſtle (ſaith he) not contented to ſay we are juſtifyed by grace, addeth thereto τῇ ἀυτῇ *his grace*, that is, by the grace which is in God, not by any gift of grace infuſed by him into our ſelves, that it might be wholly of God and not of our ſelves at all in the leaſt part. Yea not contented with all this he addeth *freely*, to notifie that there is not required any work or qualification on our part to put us into the poſſeſſion thereof, for ſo it ſhould not be wholly by the *free and naked favour of God*, as he tearms it. And laſtly he addeth *by the redemption which is by Jeſus Chriſt*, by this work of Chriſt excluding all ours; hitherto that profound *Zanchius*. Neither cannot it be freely by the redemption of Chriſt, if our qualifications and conditions be brought to intereſſe us to it, for ſo ſhould we be in ſome kinde purchaſers and not receive it freely. The Apoſtle proceeds, *ver.* 25. *Whom God hath ſet forth as a propitiation through faith in his bloud to declare his righteouſneſſe for the remiſſion of ſins, &c.* The whole thing of Gods ordination to make the redemption, propitiation and remiſſion of ſinnes which is by Chriſt, actually ours to our comfort, is here aſſigned to be faith in his blood, and not any foregoing, concomitant, or ſubſequent vertue or duty of ours annexed to it; and all *to declare his righteouſneſſe*. *Ver.* 26. *His righteouſneſſe* (he ſaith again) *that he may be juſt and the juſtifyer of him that beleeveth in Jeſus*. If Mr. *Baxters* fancy ſtand of the Legall righteouſneſſe in Chriſt, and the Evangelicall righteouſneſſe in us; the Apoſtles aſſignation of the end of Gods juſtifying us by Chriſt

Hier. Zanch De natura Dei Lib. 4. Cap. 2. Th. 2.

ſhould be maimed. For he ſhould have ſaid, To declare, to declare I ſay his righteouſneſſe, and our righteouſneſſe, that he might be juſt and a juſtifyer, and we might be juſt and juſtifyers of our ſelves. And then we are to expunge the next verſe, Where is boaſting then? it is excluded; by what law? of works? nay but by the law of faith. For boaſting ſhould not be at all excluded, if our works ſhould bear a part with faith in juſtifying: ſo ſhould we have matter of glorying in our ſelves ſtill. How full is the Apoſtle here in the confirmation of Juſtification by faith without works? had he ſeen what the Papiſts and Mr. *Baxter* over their ſhoulders would have objected againſt it, he could not have ſpoken more punctually. Yet as I know what the Papiſts ſay for themſelves, ſo I am not ignorant what Mr. *Baxter* will except for himſelf. But I reſerve the Examination thereof for another place where he goeth about to purge his doctrine from all contrariety that it hath to the doctrine of the Apoſtle, and from any derogation from the Grace of God.

A ſecond Teſtimonie or authority from Scripture we may draw from *Rom.* 4. 1, *&c.* I ſhall be ſhort in it. The Apoſtle here denies,

1 *Our father Abraham the father of the faithfull* himſelf *to have been juſtifyed by works, for then he ſhould have whereof to glory*, ver. 2, 3. But as *Abraham* was, ſo all the faithfull are juſtifyed by faith without works; or to render the words of the Text, By faith and not by works. Here Mr. *Baxter* hath no evaſion, as in the former Chapter, *viz.* that the works of the Law only are denyed, for *Abraham* was under the promiſe, not under the Law, nether was the Law then given; and the promiſe, under which he was, was without all condition of works; ſo that the Apoſtle here excludeth works indefinitely: I mean not good and evill works, for no man ever brought evill works as evill to be thereby juſtifyed. But good works, whether Legall or Evangelicall, all acts and deeds both of naturall and infuſed righteouſneſſe and holineſſe.

2 In affirming of him *that worketh, i. e.* that ſeeketh juſtification by works, that *the reward is reckoned of debt to him*, that he requires it as due, and ſhall not receive it if it be not found due in Juſtice; but to him *that worketh not, but beleeveth on him that juſtifyeth the ungodly, his faith is imputed to righteouſneſſe, i. e.* as hath

been

been already evinced, Christ by faith apprehended is of the free grace of God made righteousnesse to him. When Mr. *Baxter* therefore claps his bundle of works upon the shoulders of faith to officiate with it to justification, he teacheth us to reject the grace of God, and to exact at Gods hands both the righteousnesse of Christ, and the end of it our salvation, as a debt and due in justice. The Apostle puts no medium here either between faith and works, or between grace and debt; where workes creep up with faith to justifie in any degree, faith is destroyed, grace rejected; works alone stand pleading for justification and salvation at the barre of Gods justice, from thence alone God heareth the plea of works; in vain is it to plead them at the throne of grace, there nothing else but the plea of faith in Christ is heard and excepted, *ver.* 4, 5.

3 In describing the righteousnesse of justification to be *a righteousnesse without works, a blessednesse consisting in the covering, forgiving and not imputing of sin, ver.* 6, 7, 8. so that to obtrude works with faith into the office of justifying, is to subvert Gods justification, and erect our own, *i. e.* our own condemnation.

4. *Ver.* 16. From all his precedent reasoning the Apostle concludeth, *Therefore it is of faith that it might be by grace*: and lest this should be taken for a justification peculiar to *Abraham* and not common to all beleevers, he addeth, *that the promise might be sure to all the seed &c. which is of the faith of Abraham*: as before he had said, *that he might be the father of all them that beleeve, that righteousnesse might be imputed to them also: even to them which walke in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, ver.* 11, 12. And again afterwards, *ver.* 23. *It was not written for his sake alone that it was imputed to him, but for us also to whom it shall be imputed, if we beleeve in him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, ver.* 24. In all which places though faith and beleeving alone are named, yet are they named in opposition to and with an exclusion of works: as the attentive reader of that chapter will easily perceive.

Not to fill up the paper with any other *series* or body of disputation which the Scriptures plentifully afford for the confirmation of our doctrine, I shall only annex some scattered testimonies thereof compleatly proving the same. The whole stream of the Gospell runs this way; *We that are Jewes by nature* [in covenant with God] *and not sinners of the Gentiles,*

Knowing that a man is not juſtifyed by the works of the Law, b
by the faith of Jeſus Chriſt, even we have beleeved in Jeſus Chriſt th
we might be juſtifyed by the faith of Chriſt, and not by the works of th
Law, &c. Gal. 2. 15, 16. By the poſition of faith works are her
depoſed. *By grace are ye ſaved through faith, and that not of our ſelve*
it is the gift of God. Not of works, leſt any man ſhould boaſt, Epheſ. 2
8, 9. *Not of works, but of him that calleth, Rom.* 9. 11. *Not of him th*
willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that ſheweth mercy, Rom. 9. 1
Not by works of righteouſneſſe which we have done, but according to h
mercy, Tit. 3. 5. *This is the work of God,* [that which is in ſtead of a
works, and effectual to juſtification without all works] *to beleev*
in him whom he hath ſent, Joh. 6. 29. *They which are of faith are th*
children of Abraham, and bleſſed with our father Abraham, for
many as are of the works of the Law are curſed, Gal. 3. 7, 9, 10.
Beleeve in the Lord Jeſus, and thou ſhalt be ſaved, Act. 16. 31.
Not by the Law of works, for it is written, The juſt ſhall live by faith
Gal. 3. 11. *If by grace, then it is no more of works, elſe grace ſhould*
no more grace: if of works then, it is no more grace, elſe ſhould work
no more work, Rom. 11. 6. Hence is the oppoſition which th
holy Ghoſt every where maketh between *Gods righteouſneſſe a*
our righteouſneſſe, Rom. 10. 3. *The righteouſneſſe of faith a*
the righteouſneſſe of works, Rom. 9. 30, 31, 32. *Phil.* 3. 9, 10. an
the conſenting harmony of Scriptures that ſo oppoſe La
and Goſpell, faith and works, Gods grace and mans righteouſ
neſſe, *Moſes* and *Chriſt*, the righteouſneſſe which is by pro
miſe, and that which conſiſts in doing, Gods imputation an
our qualifications; ſo that if the one be admitted the othe
muſt be excluded from juſtification. Unto which if I ſhoul
add all of the the reſt Teſtimonies and examples of Scripture, to
gether with the Arguments which our Divines bring thence,
ſhould (to uſe Mr. *Baxters* phraſe) be neceſſitated to tranſcrib
almoſt all the Scripture that relateth to the New Covenan

The concluſion therefore of our Divines is not only tha
works have not, but alſo that they connot have any place i
or to our Juſtification, becauſe righteouſneſſe and life ar
meerly and *wholly by promiſe, even by the free and abſolute promi*
made to Abraham, which was without all conditions annexed, Gal. 3
8, 16, 17. 18. therefore without works, freely conferred on th
children of the promiſe. That they are *by inheritance*, therefo
deſcend freely upon them that are ſons by faith, *Gal.* 3. 1

He

Heb. 9. 15. *Rom.* 4. 13, 14, 16. and not attained by works. That in reſpect of the righteouſneſſe of works, *Paul knew nothing by himſelfe, wherein he was not perfectly ſincere, and ſincerely perſwaded, yet deems not himſelf to be thereby juſtifyed. for the Lord is his judge and juſtifyer* [whoſe juſtifications are free] 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. That if juſtification were in any part by works, then had man ſomewhat at leaſt, whereof to *glory before God; but he hath nothing whereof to glory*, therefore *&c. Rom.* 4. 2. That it is *by imputation* wholly, therefore cannot be from any inherent good in our ſelves, *Rom.* 4. 3, 4. That it flowes wholly from faiths object or correlate, not at all from any vertue of faith as a qualification inherent in us: much leſſe therefore from any other qualification or work of ours whatſoever. To which I might add their many other reaſons proving that works cannot juſtifie. That it is by promiſe (as I ſaid) which is ſtill oppoſed to works: *Gal.* 3. 17, 18, 22. even by that promiſe that was made to *Abraham*, which was free, abſolute, and without all condition of works, that Goſpel promiſe, *In thee all Nations of the earth ſhall be bleſſed?* A promiſe admitting only *them that are of faith to bleſſedneſſe*, but rejecting them that *are of works to the curſe*, *Gal.* 3. 7, 8, 9, 10. Yea by the ſame abſolute and unconditionall promiſe or covenant oft renewed, *Jer.* 31. 31, —— 34. 32. 40. That *this promiſe is made Yea and Amen*, ratifyed and effectuallized in Chriſt Jeſus, 2 *Cor.* 1 20. Not in works, no nor in faith as the Papiſts work, or Arminians act and deed, or otherwiſe then as it is (as *Luther* deſcribes it Allegorically) *the matter whereof Chriſt is the form, informing and giving life and vertue to it*; an act apprehending Chriſt as its object in whom all its vertue lyeth; the cloud or darkneſſe in which Chriſt dwelleth, as God was formerly in a cloud or darkneſſe upon mount *Sinai* and in the Temple: or as all our Divines ſay, the hand by which *we receive Chriſt made of God righteouſneſſe* to us and in us, *Gal.* 3. 27. 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. That the life of juſtification conſiſteth not in works at all, nor in faith conſidered in a ſenſe divided from Chriſt, but in Chriſt our life living in us; ſo that *the life which we live is by the faith of the Son of God*, by the recumbency of our ſouls by faith upon the Son of God which is our life, and that this is to live by faith, Gal. 2. 20. *Col.* 3. 4. *Gal.* 3. 11. That Chriſt with all his righteouſneſſe to remiſſion and ſalvation, is given us freely of God, (not

Luth. in Gal. Ca. 2. v. 16.

(not ſold as by *Judas* to his enemies) and ſo made ours without *money without, price*, without fine, or rent. In the Covenant of grace there is nothing ſmelling of a Simoniacall contract; it is wholly of Gods giving, not in the leaſt particle of our purchaſing, *Iſa.* 9. 6. *Joh.* 3. 16. *Iſa.* 55. 1. That the life and juſtification which are by the ſecond Adam, deſcend to us in the ſame manner with the ſin and condemnation from the firſt Adam. But theſe deſcended by our naturall union and communion with the firſt Adam, not by our imitation of him. For *death reigned from Adam, over them that had not ſinned, after the ſimilitude of Adam*: Therefore alſo righteouſneſſe and juſtification deſcend to us by the union and communion which we have with the ſecond Adam Chriſt Jeſus, and not from our imitation of him and configuration to him; *for when we were yet enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.* Not but that every one to whom the ſin and condemnation of *Adam* once deſcended, are thenceforth imitators of and configured to *Adam*: or that they to whomſoever the righteouſneſſe and juſtification of Chriſt have deſcended, do not thenceforth become imitators of and are configured to the image of Chriſt; but that theſe imitations and configurations do follow and not goe before ſuch union and communion, declaring and not producing the ſin and condemnation which are from *Adam*, or the righteouſneſſe and juſtification which are from the Lord Chriſt, *Rom.* 5. 11. 19. And this is a ſound Argument which the Apoſtle bringeth to prove that works can in no reſpect juſtifie or ſave: *For we are Gods workmanſhip* (ſaith he) *created in Chriſt Jeſus to good works, which God hath ordained before that we ſhould walk in them, Epheſ.* 2. 9, 10. where we may take notice that good works are Gods end in ſaving or juſtifying us from ſin. But the means do alway in order of nature go before and not follow the end, (in execution I mean, though not in intention.) That we are firſt in Chriſt the juſtifyer and in poſſeſſion of the juſtification that is by him, and then being new created in Chriſt to the image of God are inabled to do good works. That God hath ordained before that we ſhould walk in them being ſaved or juſtifyed, not that we ſhould be ſaved or juſtifyed by them. That *the righteouſneſſe of God* [by which we are juſtifyed] *is from faith to faith*, not begun by faith and ended in works, which according to the Apoſtle is a *beginning in the ſpirit*

ſpirit, and a ſeeking to be *perfected by the fleſh*, *Rom.* 1. 17. *Gal.* 3. 3. Should I proceed ſo far as the Scriptures as a leading thread would guide me for the confirmation of juſtification without works, I ſhould be taken as exorbitant. For the reſt I ſhall refer the reader to ſuch writers as have handled the point of juſtification againſt the Papiſts; or to the diſputations of the Apoſtle himſelf againſt the falſe Apoſtles who taught the ſame doctrine with Mr. *Baxter*, though not expreſly in the ſame words. They taught that we cannot be ſaved by Chriſt, by faith in Chriſt alone, except we be circumciſed and keep the Law, or do the works which the Law commandeth, *Act.* 15. 1, 24. Mr. *Baxter* teacheth in this his 60. *Theſis*, that

60. *The bare act of beleeving is not the onely condition of the New Covenant; but ſeverall other duties alſo are parts of that condition.*

If we take together with his words that which in the precedent Chapter we have manifeſted to be his meaning in theſe words, and that by the *bare act of beleeving*, he underſtands faith without and in oppoſition to works (for himſelf knoweth that it is his Pontificall-Arminian-Socinian, not our Proteſtant Evangelicall doctrine which holds out juſtification by beleeving as either a *bare* or a *cloathed act* or *work*) then he teacheth the ſame doctrine for which the Apoſtle anathematized the falſe Apoſtles and arch-church-troublers in his time, *Gal.* 1. 7, 8, 9. & 5. 12. And what the Apoſtle hath againſt them is againſt Mr. *Baxter* their own ſon (I will not ſay in the faith, but) in perverting the faith and Goſpell. For neither did they deny faith, but Mr. *Baxters* bare faith, faith without works to be effectuall to juſtification.

Againſt this aſſertion common to him and them, if there were no other Scriptures contradicting, but what I have alleaged, no arguments brought by our Divines to ſubvert it, and to eſtabliſh the contrary doctrine, but what have been here expreſſed and implied; (all which are ſcarce a drop of their full bucket) yet doth Mr. *Baxter* declare any ſingleneſſe of heart, or ſincere aime to advance the glory and truth of God, in ſuppreſſing all this and all the reſt in ſilence, ſo to beguile his more Logicall then Theologicall readers (whom he knowes to be more acquainted with Sophiſtry

then Divinity, with exotick ſcriblings then Canonicall Scriptures) with an opinion that the ſtream of Scriptures runs all to his Mill, and that we have nothing from the Word favouring our cauſe?

Neither let any object that our Churches do only deny the merit of works, not the neceſſity of them as a condition to juſtification. Herein I ſhall have a fit place to ſpeak afterward to Mr. *Baxter* and as it is his plea to lenifie his ſelf-arrogating aſſertion. In the interim to manifeſt the ſimplicity of our gudgeons that are apt to ſwallow the moſt portentous errours if offered to them involved in fine terms of logicall notions among whom ſome that erewhile did proſecute with bel, book and candle, ſome to death, ſome to baniſhment, ſome to ſequeſtration whom they thought but to ſmell a little of the perſumes of the purple whore; Theſe very ſame men now having inriched themſelves with the ſpoyles of them whom by their outcries the erewhile purſued, are mad to drench themſelves with the very dregs of the cup of fornication which is in the hand of the whore, and kiſſe the lips of Mr. *Baxter* which hath bleſſed with plauſible words the doctrine which before they deteſted and curſed; and withall to ſhew how degenerate theſe are from our antient worthies, who as Champions of Chriſt have defended the article of juſtification againſt the whole rabble of Antichriſt I ſhall declare how little difference they were wont to put between merits and conditions, that though they held ſomewhat to differ in the ſound, yet held them to be one in ſubſtance and ſtill concluded againſt the Papiſts that there is no place for works in the office of juſtification, either as merits or conditions thereof; but that when the Scripture ſaith we are juſtified without works, all works both of Law and Goſpell, are excluded from being any way ſubſervient to juſtification, either to the beginning or finiſhing thereof, either as meriting it or conditioning us for it. I ſhall mention only ſome few (leſt I ſhould ſeem to attribute much to the authority of men) yet ſo that theſe few ſpeak out the mind and deliver the common judgement of all the reſt.

First, I ſhall produce that famous *Martyrologiſt* Mr. *Fox*, what he ſpeaketh to this purpoſe in that book of his *De Chriſto gratis juſtificante*. Having alleaged that teſtimony of the Apoſtle Rom. 4. 16. *It is of faith that it might be of grace, to the end that the promiſe mig-*

might be sure, &c. he addeth, *Atqui quonam modo firma, nisi sit gratuita? aut quo modo gratuita, si quoquam modo ex operibus?* i. e. But how is the promise sure, except it be free? or in what manner or respect free, if in any manner or respect it be of works? Thus he excludeth works in all respects either of causality or conditionality from justification. Again, *Duo sunt promissionum genera, plurimum inter se diversa: alterum ad legem spectans certis adnexum conditionibus, alterum Evangelii proprium sine omni legis conditione gratuitum,* i. e. There are two kinds of promises [made in Scripture] much differing either from other: the one legall, tyed to certain conditions; the other Evangelicall or proper to the Gospell, free and without all conditions of the Law, not tyed to any conditions as the legall promises are. *Fox de Christo gratis. Justif. p. 127.* *Idem ibid. p. 221.*

Unto him I annex Dr. *Fulk*, in that Sermon of his which Mr. *Fox* translated out of English into Latine, and annexed to the end of that Tractate of his own before-mentioned. *Isaac not Ismael* (saith he) *had the inheritance: Quia nimirum unica ad hanc hæreditatem perveniendi via patet, per solam promissionem, solam misericordiam, solam fidem. Ismael vero juxta carnem natus est, Isaac per promissionem. Hæreditas autem sola nititur promissione; promissio vero nulla meritorum pactione, sed sola Dei misericordia perficitur,* i. e. Because there is opened one only way to the inheritance, *viz.* by promise alone, mercy alone, faith alone. But *Ismael* was born after the flesh, *Isaac* by promise. But the inheritance is grounded upon promise only, and the promise is accomplished without any paction [or condition of works] by the sole mercy of God. And a little after, *Certissimos se hæredes sciant ii, qui ad Isaaci exemplum ita se comparent, ut nullo alio ad eam titulo admittantur, nisi sola Dei promissione; quique non nisi gratia solum ad eam aspirant: qui denique fide eam sola amplectuntur; non meritis, non operum studiis, viam ad eam affectant,* i. e. Let them know themselves to be most certain heirs, who after the pattern of *Isaac*, do bend to it upon no other title but the alone promise of God: and who aspire to it by grace alone: and lastly, who embrace it by faith onely, and affect not the way to it, by merits or any endevours of their own works. And anon after, *Quemadmodum legale justitiæ fœdus exquisitam omnibus modis innocentiam ita flagitat, ut nullam veniæ spem largiatur delinquenti: ita Evangelica altera illa ictu nobiscum pactio misericordiæ, justitiam nobis gratuitam exhibet, nullamque exigit operum adjunctam conditionem,* i. e. Even as the legall covenant of justice *Dr. Fulkis concio. p. 13.* *Id. ibid. p. 19.* *Id. ibid. p. 22.*

ſo requires of us an innocency in all reſpects exquiſite, that it gives no hope of pardon to the offender: So that other Goſpell Covenant of mercy made with us, holds forth to us a free righteouſneſſe, and requires no additory condition of works. And in the next page he affirmes the promiſe or cove-
Id. p. 23. nant of the Goſpell to be *gratuitam omnibus nulliſque impeditam conditionibus*, free to all men, or from all, and intangled with no conditions.

In the third place I annex Mr. *Calvin* that great light ſhining from the hand of Chriſt upon all the reformed Churches. I. *juſtificare dicitur fides* (ſaith he) *quod oblatam in Evangelio juſtitiam recipit & amplectitur*; *Quod autem per Evangelium dicitur offerri, ea excluditur omnis operum conſideratio, i. e.* Faith is hence ſaid to juſtifie because it receiveth and embraceth the righteouſneſſe offered in the Goſpell. But in that it is ſaid to be offered in the Goſpell, hereby all conſideration of works is excluded: and ſo works in all conſiderations either of cauſality or conditionality totally rejected. And having proved this from the difference which the Apoſtle putteth between the Law and the Goſpell, *Rom.* 10. 3.
Calv. Juſt. lib. 3. *cap.* 11. §. 17. *& deinceps*, he addeth, *Videſne ut legis & Evangelii diſcrimen hoc faciat, quod illa operibus juſtitiam tribuat, hoc citra operum ſubſidium gratuitam largiatur? i. e.* Ye ſee what difference he maketh between the Law and the Goſpell, that the Law attributeth righteouſneſſe to works, the Goſpell gives it free without the aſſiſtance of works. An excellent place (ſaith he) and that which will extricate us from many difficulties, if we underſtand, *eam quæ datur nobis per Evangelium juſtitiam legis conditionibus ſolutam eſſe, i. e.* that the righteouſneſſe which is given us by the Goſpell is cleared from the conditions of the Law. And then ſpeaking of the oppoſition that the Apoſtle maketh between the Law and the Promiſe, *Gal.* 3. 18. It cannot be denyed (ſaith he) that the Law hath alſo its Promiſes, and therefore there muſt be ſomething in the Promiſes of the Goſpell diſtinct from thoſe of the Law, elſe could there be no ſuch oppoſition; and concludes that the difference is this, *that the Goſpell promiſes are free, ac ſola Dei miſericordia ſuffultæ, quum legis promiſſiones ab operum conditione pendeant, i. e.* and leaning upon the ſole mercy of God, when the promiſes of the Law depend upon the condition of works.

Likewiſe

Likewise in the next Section from that of *Gal.* 3. 2. *Hab.* 2. 4. we are not justifyed by the Law, because the just shall live by faith, he addeth, that this argument cannot stand, unlesse it be consented unto *in calculum fidei non venire opera, sed prorsus separanda esse*, *i. e.* that works have nothing to do, in the bor- *Idem ibid.* §. 18. ders of faith to justifie, but must be wholly separated from it, and proceeds, that the Law and faith are here opposed. Therefore because works are required to the righteousnesse of the one, *ergo sequitur ad hujus justitiam non requiri*, it follows therefore that they are not required to the righteousnesse of the other; and further in the same place, Herein the Gospell differs from the Law, *quod operibus non alligat justitiam, sed in sola dei misericordia collocat*, that it binds not righteousnesse to works, but placeth it in the sole mercy of God. And, *Fides sine operum admixtione &c.* *Faith without any proppage of works resteth wholly upon mercy.* And that wherewith he concludes this Section; That the righteousnesse by which we are justifyed is not ushered into our possession by works, *nec operando nos eam consequi, sed vacuos accedere ut eam recipiamus*, *i. e.* not that we attain it by working, but come with our hands empty of all works to be filled with it.

With those agreeth *Ph. Melanchthon*, *Evangelium offert remissionem seu imputationem justitiæ & vitam æternam sine conditione legis aut operum nostrorum*, *i. e.* the Gospell offers remission by the imputation of righteousnesse, and eternall life without condition of the Law or our works. Again, *Vulgo imaginantur homines Evangelium esse promissionem conditionalem: at ab hac imaginatione abducendi sunt*, *i. e.* Men must be drawn off from that vulgar imagination that the Gospell is a conditionall promise.

And upon *Rom.* 4. *Credens est salvus sola fide sine operibus*; *Neque nostra obedientia aut causa est aut conditio propter quam accepti sumus coram Deo*, *i. e.* He that beleeveth is saved by faith only, without works; Neither is our obedience either a cause or a condition for which we are accepted before God.

So *Zanchius* in *Hos.* 2. 21. *Notandum est hanc esse simplicem & Evangelicam sine omni conditione promissionem: Hic nihil exigit Deus sed simpliciter promittit quod velit ipse*, &c. This is a simple and Evangelicall promise [which is] without all condition; where

God requireth nothing, but ſimply promiſeth what h pleaſeth.

As for *Luther* it is ſuperfluous to cite him being ever where ſo full both in the poſiting and confirming of thi doctrine; let but his Sermon upon *Tit.* 3. 5. be read; h ſhall be there found calling it *deuilliſh doctrine, and the teacher thereof Hypocrites, who teach ſalvation to be far off* (and no already attained) and to be ſought for by works: conclu ding, *Quicunque ſalutem non ex mera gratia per fidem an omnia opera*, &c. whoſoever receives not ſalvation out o meer grace, by faith, *before all works*, he ſhall never b ſaved.

I had a purpoſe to have annexed the Teſtimonies of ſom more of the Chieftains againſt Antichriſt, but there is no need Mr. *Baxter* for his part is not a *Zizca*, warreth not by othe mens eyes, ſeeth and knoweth againſt whom he levelleth, i not ignorant that all, eſpecially the more antient and un ſophiſticated worthies of all the Churches, ſpeak the ſam things and in the ſame tone with theſe againſt the Papiſt Neither was it my purpoſe to deal at all in this paſſage wit Mr. *Baxter*, but to ſhew the vanity of ſome Phariſaicall Cabaliſticall, Sophiſticall, but little Scripturall and Theo logicall Rabbies, who with Anti-evangelicall ſpirits, (partl to ſet up again a Babell or Babylon of works, as a moun againſt Antinomianiſm, as they term the liberty and purit of the Goſpell; and partly in a proſtrate devotion wherewit they ſacrifice to every Barbariſm and Aphoriſm of exotic arts, to which they muſt ſubmit though it be to the denyin of the whole word of God, for fear they ſhould not be re ckoned Scholars:) are ready to gallop after Mr. *Baxter* Sophiſticall Lectures into the very Lateran of *Rome*, no knowing whence they run nor whither, whoſe compan they leave, and whoſe they follow; ſuch levity and giddineſs hath taken their head-pieces; that as having gotten a pro feſſed Proteſtant Divine to lead them into the worſt ſink o Popery, they run with head and ſhoulders, thronging wh ſhall be foremoſt: ſo no doubt, if under the profeſſion o miſpriſion of a Jeſuite *Paul* himſelf ſhould deſcend to preac again and maintain the Doctrine of the Goſpell in all it

verity, power and purity, (and not in a dialecticall phraſe) they would throw it back in his face, as Jeſuiticall and devilliſh. For without ſuch lightneſſe and emptineſſe it were impoſſible for them to be ſo ſuddenly and eaſily whirled into an applauſe of an aſſertion ſo groſly and palpably Poliſh and Damning, by a peeviſh veneration of the learning and holineſſe of the Penman thereof. As if among the Jewiſh Scribes and Phariſees, and Popiſh Monkes and Jeſuits, there were not to be found in depth of Learning, and ſtrictneſſe of Legall righteouſneſſe many to whom this man may poſſibly ſerve, and but ſerve as a ſhaddow.

But it ſufficeth here to have manifeſted that the Doctrine of Mr. *Baxter* is totally the ſame (in this particular) with the doctrine of the Jeſuits. Or if in any reſpect we ſhall find it in what remains to be examined, not wholly the ſame; I doubt not but in every ſuch difference which we ſhall meet with, to demonſtrate that it is far worſe then theirs. Or if it be not ſo, let him produce any one knowing man within any of the Proteſtant Churches (except he will make the Conciſion of Socinians and Arminians the true Proteſtants) that hath ever taught or held this doctrine.

CHAP.

Chap. III.

The firſt Argument for Juſtification by Works, drawn from Scriptures examined. The Scriptures [*cited*] *prepared to Mr.* Baxters *hand by the Papiſts; and the Proteſtants anſwer to all the Arguments drawn from thoſe Scriptures by the Papiſts, by him concealed and the abhorrency of thoſe Scriptures from the concluſion, which they are brought to prove, demonſtrated.*

HAving in part ſupplyed what Mr. *Baxter* would have buryed here in ſilence, ſome of the Scriptures and Arguments from Scriptures which are brought by the Proteſtants to remove works from having concurrence with faith in the buſineſſe of juſtifying; let us now examine the Scriptures which he quoteth to prove their cooperation with faith to juſtifie. Here (as I ſaid) we meet not with words but figures partly therefore becauſe he maintains the ſame aſſertion with the Papiſts, partly becauſe the Scriptures which he quoteth are all ſuch as the Papiſts have urged before him againſt us ſo that he hath taken them up at the ſecond hand, as they were collected to his hand by the Fryers and Jeſuits, himſelf not expreſſing how he would argue from thoſe Scriptures; I conceive it is his deſire that we ſhould underſtand he means ſo to argue as his Maſters have done before him. My labour therefore here will be the leſſe, becauſe the labour of ſo many before me hath been ſo full to manifeſt how alien and improper theſe Scriptures are to defend what theſe men would have defended by them. For why ſhould I ſay again what ſo many worthies have ſaid, untill Mr. *Baxter* ſhall make it his taske to prove ſome infirmity and inſufficiency in that which they have ſpoken?

All that Mr. *Baxter* here ſaith he doth almoſt wholely tranſcribe out of *Bellarmine*, giving us a compendium of what *Bellarmine* hath at large, and ſo Mr. *Baxter* here

is but *Bellarmine* abridged. Let us lay them together, and
1 They jumpe in one common concluſion,

That the bare act of beleeving, ſaith Mr. Baxter, *faith alone, ſaith* Bel- *Theſ.* 60.
larmine, *is not the only condition of Juſtification; but many other duties,* &c.

One of theſe duties according to *Bellarmine* firſt, and after him according to Mr. *Baxter* here, is Repentance. In this alone they differ that Mr. *Baxter* puts Repentance as the firſt, and *Bellarmine* puts it as the fourth in order after Faith, and concurring with it in the pardon of ſin, and ſalvation. The Scriptures which Mr. *Baxter* alleageth for repentance are ſome from *Bellarmine*, ſome from *Bellarmines* fellowes. *Explicat. p.* 234.

To this place I referred thoſe Scriptures which Mr. *Baxter* quoted, *Theſ.* 14. *pa.* 90. beginning with *Mark.* 1. 15. to prove repentance a collaterall with faith. All which are here quoted over again ſaving theſe three, *Act.* 20. 21. *Revel.* 2. 5. & *ver.* 16. All which three Scriptures ſpeak no leſſe home to his purpoſe, then if he ſhould thus argue: *Kederminſter* is in *Worceſterſhire, ergo*, it ſupports *Pauls* Church at *London*. *Act.* 20. 21. The Apoſtle having affirmed himſelf to have dealt faithfully in preaching all that was profitable to them, to evince it, gathers into two heads the ſum of all his doctrine which he had teſtifyed among them, *viz. Repentance toward God, and faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt:* what is there in this to prove repentance a concomitant with faith to juſtifie? is every profitable doctrine effectuall to juſtifie? A mans food and garments are both profitable to him, ſhall I therefore concude either that his garments do nouriſh him, or his meat clothe him? *Revel.* 2. 5, Chriſt admoniſheth the Angell of the Church of *Epheſus*, *To repent and do his firſt works, elſe will he come and remove his candleſtick out of its place, except he repent:* what is this to juſtification? will he ſay that the removing of the candleſtick out of its place, was either the juſtifying of the unjuſtifyed, or unjuſtifying of him that was before juſtifyed? And *Revel.* 2. 16. Chriſt cals upon the Angell of the Church at *Pergamos*, *Repent, or elſe I will come to thee quickly, and will fight againſt them* [*viz.* the *Balaamites* and *Nicholaitans* mentioned in the two former verſes] *with the ſword of my mouth.* Surely Mr. *Baxter* muſt flie from the latter and rationall meaning, and follow

the precepts of *Origen* in fishing after the Spirit, or an Allegori call sense of these words, to make them speak any thing fo his justification by repentance. All the rest Scripture quoted in the 14. *Thesis*, we have again in a bunch her *pa.* 235. in the explication of his 60. *Thesis* to prove the sam thing.

And here why doth he deal worse then *Bellarmine*, in attri buting justification which he makes to consist in pardon an salvation, to repentance, without manifesting, as *Bellarmine* doth what he means by repentance? This is but to strive about word and leave the matter in darkenesse. As for the other particula Scriptures here quoted, if I should particularly examine them, w should find not a few of them (as the three former) coming ne neerer to the question in hand then Tybris doth to Thames. As fo all such of them as have the least shew or sound of speaking fo him, he hath them in part from *Bellarmine* whom he here followeth and in part from other Jesuits and Fryers that controversall handle the Popish justification against us. I refer therefore th reader to informe himself from the many answers of the man Protestant Theologists which they have extant against *Bellarmi* and the rest of that generation; from whom, if truth and sober nesse be dear to him, it is almost unpossible but that he must re ceive satisfaction.

Yet something shall I speak in generall of these quoted Scri ptures. As many of them as do hold forth the promise o life upon condition of repentance to sinners, or to sinner if they repent (all the rest quotations being altogether be sides the purpose:) [These all] speak of a legall or of a Evangelicall repentance. Of a legall repentance consisting meer ly in a feeling of, humiliation and contrition for, hatred against departing from sinne; and applying of the endeavours to al morall vertue and obedience. This is a meerly morall repen tance derivable from the strength of naturall conscience illumi nated by the Law and common knowledge of Gods will an nature. In this sense is the word taken in most of the Scripture quoted from the old Testament, and some also possibly of thos that are quoted out of the new. But then the life by these Scri ptures promised is not the life of justification, or of spirituall an supernaturall blessednesse: but that which the administration under the Law is wont to call life, *viz.*

1 The fruition of the land of *Canaan*, which prefigured the life and rest both of grace and glory. And

2 Of the blessings of health, honour, peace, plenty, safety, and other temporall benefits promised to the obedient in the Land of *Canaan*.

This is clear to him that will see, from the 18 of *Ezek.* where so often mention is made of life and death, Turn and live, if ye turn not ye shall die: what is here meant by this life and death, may be understood from that proverb cursedly used by the Jews whereof mention is made in the beginning of the Chapter; *The fathers have eaten sowre grapes and the childrens teeth are set on edge*: the fathers have sinned, and death is inflicted upon the children for their fathers fault. This gave occasion for the delivery of all the doctrine comprehended within this Chapter, in which God throughly vindicateth his justice from inflicting death upon the children, righteous children, for their wicked parents offences; shewing how justly they dyed which dyed, and lived which lived, in reference to their own not their fathers sinne and righteousnesse: what then was this death here denounced, or the setting of the teeth on edge, but the plague, famine, sword, which had been upon them in the Land, and their captivity and exile now upon them in Babylon out of the Land of their inheritance? these temporall evills are the death here affirmed to be inflicted, and denounced to be continued upon them. The life promised upon condition of their repentance, and turning from their evill wayes, was their restauration to the land, and blessings of the land of *Canaan* again. The same is evident from the words of *Moses*, in *Deuteronomy*, where *Moses* having in the name of God, pronounced the many blessings and whole confluence of secular happinesse to the obedient, and to them that after much transgression and many curses for their transgressions should repent and turn; and denounced curses upon curses, a whole deluge of judgements, and temporary afflictions one on the neck of another against as many as should disobey the Commandements, &c. *cap.* 28. & *cap.* 29. he doth *cap.* 30. 15, 19. *Call heaven and earth to witnesse that he had done his duty* in setting before them *life and death, good and evill, blessing and cursing*, inplying the life and death here mentioned consisted chiefly in outward prosperity and adversity, stroaking and striking. That these were the apples and the rods to allure and terrifie them yet in their minority and

under a pædagogie, untill faith ſhould come and the Sun of tighteouſneſſe ſhine in its ſplendor, that they might walk by faith, and not by feeling, act from love, and not from fear, from the Spirit of adoption, and not of bondage: ſo that this ſhadie life promiſed to a legall repentance, is nothing to the life of juſtification, but ſo far beneath it, that it is in no capacity to be uſed as a prooſe about it. Theſe therefore ſerve not at all to drive on Mr. *Baxters* concluſion.

In the ſecond place, Thoſe Scriptures which he quotes that offer life upon condition of Evangelicall repentance doe not make for him any more then the former. For Goſpell repentance, is taken either in a large or ſtrict ſenſe, in the more large ſenſe it is the ſame with converſion or regeneration, and oft times equipollent and the ſame thing with faith, (though ſome little conſider it to be ſo.) And this is as oft as repentance is put for the one and whole thing required on our part to put us into the actuall and ſenſible poſſeſſion of the grace and life of the Goſpell, as *Mat.* 3. 2. *Mark.* 6. 12. *Repent, for the Kingdom of God is at hand.* The ſumme of their preaching was *Repent*, ſo *Luk.* 13. 3, 5. *Except ye repent ye ſhall all likewiſe periſh.* & 24. 47. and many other of the Scriptures which he quoteth. In all theſe places repentance containeth primarily the change of our relation, and but ſecondarily of our qualifications and manners. It is a *quidam motus*, in which *acti agimus*, being moved by Gods Spirit we move; the *terminus a quo* in this motion is ſelf, our ſelf-righteouſneſſe and ſelf-confidences, from which we turn no leſſe then from our polluted ſelf, ſinfull ſelf, and ſinfull wayes. The *terminus ad quem* is God, the grace of God inviting us. The *medium per quod* is the Lord Chriſt through whom we have acceſſe to the Father for remiſſion firſt; and then for ſanctification alſo. And as the ſcope of the Goſpell requires us to underſtand in ſuch Scriptures repentance in this ſenſe, ſo neither do the two Greek words, rendered in Latin *Reſipiſcentia*, in Engliſh Repentance, refuſe this ſenſe. For what is that change of the mind, of the judgement, wiſdome and will when it is taken for a Theologicall vertue, but a change of theſe in reference to happineſſe? A renouncing of and departing from natures groaping and erring directions, by our own works and righteouſneſſe to ſeek for bleſſedneſſe; and a cleaving

to

to the directions of the Goſpell pointing out Chriſt as the alone way to it? For inſtance, *Paul* while yet impenitent and unconverted, walked by the light of his naturall conſcience, as it was informed and awaked by the Law, and by this rule walked as a ſtrict Phariſee; *touching the righteouſneſſe which is in the Law blameleſſe*, *Phil.* 3. 5, 6. and looking (as Mr. *Baxter* doth) upon the doctrine of free grace, and righteouſneſſe freely imputed, as upon a licentious doctrine, was carried with full ſails of zeal totally to deſtroy it: *I verily thought with my ſelf* (ſaith he) *that I ought to do many things againſt the Name of Jeſus*, &c. *which thing I alſo did*, &c. *Act.* 26. 9, 10. Now when the Lord Chriſt met him in the midſt of his raging madneſſe, ſo working upon his heart that he now beleeved in Chriſt whom he had erewhile perſecuted, received him and reſted on him for righteouſneſſe, whom he had erewhile blaſphemed: What will ye call this obedience to the faith, this cloſing of his heart with Chriſt in ſtead of further daſhing againſt him? was it not his converſion, his repentance? or is the promiſe of life (I mean the life of juſtification) made to any other repentance beſides this? In this ſenſe therefore repentance is not a *quid diſtinctum*, a thing diſtinct from, but one and the ſame with juſtifying faith; or if it be objected that it is ſomewhat larger then juſtifying faith; I ſhall not contend but acknowledge that it comprehends whole faith, both *qua juſtificat*, *& qua ſanctificat*, to juſtification and to ſanctification. Yet this hinders not but that theſe two phraſes, repentance to life or remiſſion of ſins, and faith to life and the remiſſion of ſins, are in the language of the holy Ghoſt one and the ſame.

Where repentance is taken in a ſtricter ſenſe, and ſome of the Scripture, which he quotes ſeem to promiſe remiſſion of ſins or life to it; we muſt neceſſarily underſtand of every ſuch Scriptures that it ſpeaketh of the repentance which is actuated in our firſt converſion and calling, or after it. That which is in our firſt converſion or calling, when it is taken in a ſtrict ſenſe, is not as in the former ſenſe put as the whole thing required on our parts, but ſeems in words a coordinate with faith to intereſt us in the righteouſneſſe and life which are by Chriſt. Such are theſe Scriptures, *Repent and beleeve the Goſpell: repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, *Mark.* 1. 15, *Act.* 20. 21. and many other. But in theſe, repentance and

faith together make up no more then in other Scriptures, either faith alone or repentance alone in their large ſenſe import; and ſo repentance is taken for ſelf-denyall, ſelf-abhorring, ſelf-ſubduing, and faith for embracing Chriſt: both theſe are repentance or faith in their larger ſenſe. To no other end doth repentance caſt and empty out ſelf but to be filled with Chriſt, nor doth faith receive Chriſt untill ſelf be let out and evacuated
Phi.3.8,9. that it may receive him. See we it in *Paul, his caſting away* his *own righteouſneſſe as dung and loſſe, and putting on of Chriſt*, to win and wear him for righteouſneſſe, were two concurrent acts either of one faith or one repentance, (for we may uſe after the holy Ghoſt, either term indifferently) and repentance here is no diſtinct thing from faith, nor faith from repentance, and in naming theſe two the holy Ghoſt nameth not two gifts of grace, but two acts of the ſame gift of grace in us; ſo that hitherto the Scriptures which Mr. *Baxter* quotes to prove that repentance as a really diſtinct thing from faith juſtifyeth, do wholly fail him. For (as our Divines well ſay againſt the Papiſts) though theſe two acts muſt needs cooperate together, *viz.* the caſting out of ſelf and the receiving of Chriſt; yet it is the latter alone that doth properly and inſtrumentally juſtifie by receiving the juſtifyer and his righteouſneſſe; the former act doth but *diſponere materiam* (as one ſaith not too catachreſtically) doth but put a man as it were in a juſtifiable poſture and capacity, doth but *obicem tollere*, pluck out and caſt away the barre that might faſten the door againſt Chriſts entrance; and this it doth not as a diſtinct vertue from faith, but as a ſubſervient act of faith to its receiving of Chriſt.

Laſtly, thoſe of the forequoted Scriptures which ſpeak of repentance in a ſtrict ſenſe advantagious to life after converſion, and that which the Papiſts and Mr. *Baxter* call *the firſt juſtification*, (as 2 *Cor.*7. 10. and ſome other) [theſe] ſpeak of repentance indeed really diſtinct from faith, being an effect or fruit of faith. But this repentance is in no other ſenſe called repentance to life, then as by it the Saints ſometimes recover the ſenſe and comfort of their juſtification, that had for a while laid fainting in them; or as it is impowred from above to repair, confirme and increaſe the life of ſanctification in them. And this is beſides the queſtion in hand, [whether repentance juſtifyeth.] I ſhall therefore pretermit to ſpeak futher of it. And thus have we one file of his

his Scripture quotations examined, and do finde that all which he would thence deduce to confirme a collaterall officiating of repentance [as a thing really distinct from faith] together with faith to justification; stands him in no stead at all.

The second duty which he nameth as an equall condition with faith, of our justification, *is praying for pardon, and forgiving others.* In this though he follow *Bellarmine*, yet he holds not himself to *Bellarmines* words, but having overtaken him, runs beyond him. *Bellarmine* thus speaketh, having mentioned before two things that justifie, Thirdly, (saith he) *Spes obtinendæ veniæ, etiam dispositio ad justitiam et remissionem peccatorum, i. e.* Hope of forgiveneſſe is also a disposition to righteousneſſe and the remission of sins. Mr. *Baxter* outruns him and saith, that praying for pardon, and forgiving of others too, are conditions of pardon; but suppose that I do hope and pray for pardon, and forgive others too, shall I then be forgiven? Mr. *Baxter* will not promise that, but if I do that, (*cæteris paribus*) then forsooth I may hope well: but what is this *sensus compositus*, or *cæteris paribus?* viz. if I do this and all that else is to be done, *i. e.* all the duties which either Law or Gospell commands me. But I demand, if all this be done, am I then justifyed? Neither will he grant me this: I am then conditionally justifyed, as I was before I did any thing; yea more, I am now a probationer for justification, and upon my *bene se gesserit*, my good behaviour, I am justifyed for an hour possibly untill I be unjustifyed again: but if I do all and never cease to do all either while I am living, *&c.* or when I am dead; there may be possibly a day, (when there be no more days) when I may (if all things faie well) be justifyed. But further that all may faie well, will he tell me what the *cæteris paribus*, the rest conditions are, that I may perform them all and not misse in number? Thus far possibly he will condescend, to make known some of them, and to give me some generalls of the rest, and make known the *materia prima* in which the substantiall formes lurk, yea the *genera* and the *species* that are such *subalternatim*, but the *species specialissimas & infimas* together with their individuals, he either will not or cannot particularize the seed of Mr. *Baxter* in this kind is more numerous then the seed of *Abraham*, more then the starres of heaven, then the sands of the sea for multitude; yet if

Pag. 230.

one

one be wanting, I am as far from justification as if I had nothing: So blessed a man will Mr. *Baxters* conditions make me. But let me on the contrary part demand of Mr. *Baxter*, Suppose a person truely in the Covenant of grace, vitally in Christ, if he have never a one of these additory conditions actually moving in him, is not his justification and glory as certain as another's that hath all the conditions? Mr. *Baxter* dares not deny the supposition to be possible; for then shall he exclude all dying Infants from the kingdome of heaven, which in another book of his it is said he flatly denyeth) the consequent therefore cannot be denyed, that justification before God is as sure without as with these conditions; and so no condition at all to be granted of our justification, save that which may assure and declare it to our selves. What mis-spent time will it be then to bawl about two or three of many decads and centuries, yea myriads of conditions, by disputing whether they be conditions; when if we know not and have not all the rest it shall go as well with those that have none of them, as with them that have all to one? I had almost said, when these all brought as conditions (in Mr. *Baxters* sense) to Gods tribunal will without doubt condition him that brings them, to condemnation.

But because Mr. *Baxter* and his disciples may be angry if we hear not what so great a Master saith, for our own safety we will attend to hear what Scriptures he alleageth.

The first he brings from the prayer of *Solomon*, 1 *King.* 8. 30. 39. *Hear* (Lord) *thy servants when they shall pray towards or in this place, and forgive them, and give to every man according to his ways.* What will hence follow? either, *ergo* whosoever prayeth in or towards *Solomons* Temple in *Jerusalem* shall be forgiven, so far as forgiveness consisteth in giving to every man according to his ways; or shall be forgiven *as to the famine and pestilence*, &c. *ver.* 38 mentioned, so as he pray *ceteris paribus* though he be never forgiven as to hell fire: or, *ergo* there was a time when prayer for pardon was a condition of forgiveness, *viz.* when the Temple stood at *Jerusalem*, if prayer were made in it or toward it; but now since the desolation of the Temple this condition for the space of 1600. years, hath been out of force. Let him conclude better for himself from these premises if he can

I can conclude no better thence to the maintenance of his aſſertion. And it is worthy of conſideration to take notice how extremely the Apoſtles logick and Mr. *Baxters* logick do differ. From the like promiſe of ſalvation made in Scriptures to them that pray for it, the Apoſtle concludes that we are juſtifyed and ſaved by faith; thus, *Whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord ſhall be ſaved. How then ſhall they call upon him in whom they have not beleeved?* His argumentation runs thus, Whoſoever do [rightly] call upon the name of the Lord ſhall be ſaved: but beleevers only call [rightly] upon the name of the Lord: *ergo*, beleevers only ſhall be ſaved. He argues here from the effect to the cauſe, from acceptable prayer, to faith from whence it floweth; concluding, that ſalvation is promiſed to prayer, not as it is an act performed in its ſelf, but as it is a fruit of faith, aſcribing all the furtherance unto ſalvation by prayer, to faith that breaths it out, and all the efficacy which faith hath to ſalvation, to the Lord [*i.e.* the grace of God, or Chriſt the Mediatour] beleeved in. So making faith to be that which, in the vertue of its object, ſaveth; and not prayer either in its act, or in reſpect of the ſpirituall diſpoſition of the heart to pray. Rom. 10. 13, 14.

And with the Apoſtles argument from prayer to faith, I might alſo argue to manifeſt that the Scriptures which Mr. *Baxter* quoteth to prove that forgiving of others is a collaterall condition with faith to juſtification or forgiveneſſe, have no force in them to prove ſuch a concluſion. *viz. Mat.* 6. 12, 14, 15. *Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtours, for if we forgive men their treſpaſſes, your heavenly father will alſo forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their treſpaſſes, neither will your heavenly father forgive your treſpaſſes. Mat.* 18. 35. *So likewiſe ſhall my heavenly father do to you alſo, if ye from your hearts forgive not every man to his brother their treſpaſſes.* The like alſo in *Mar.* 11. 25, 26. *When ye ſtand praying forgive*, &c. as in the former Scriptures. *Luke* 6. 35. *Forgive and ye ſhall be forgiven. Iſa.* 5. 15. *And the prayer of faith ſhall ſave the ſick, and if he hath committed ſins they ſhall be forgiven him. Joh.* 14. 13, 14. *Whatſoever ye ſhall aske in my Name I will do it*, &c. 1 *Joh.* 5. 15. *Whatſoever we aske, we know that we have the petitions that we deſired of him.* The reſt have nothing of ſound, much leſſe of ſubſtance to the purpoſe for which they are quoted.

How much theſe Scriptures together with thoſe of the former

bunch that were intended by Mr. *Baxter* for the toyſting in of Repentance, and of the next bundle that he would have to force in all the works of love and obedience into the office of juſtification, may prevail with ſome ſimple and ignorant perſons, I know not. For theſe not being able to compare Scripture with Scripture, and ſpirituall things with ſpirituall, nor to ſearch into the pith and bottom of Scriptures, are *carried* (as the Apoſtle ſaith) *with every wind and ſound of doctrine, whither their ſeducers will.* But I do not comprehend what Mr. *Baxters* deſigne is, who having compiled this work chiefly, if not only, for the reading of the Learned, ſhould fardle up together theſe Scriptures to deceive ſuch: for the very quotations will ſend them not only to the Scriptures, but alſo to the Commentators upon theſe ſeverall Scriptures, where they muſt needs find him and the Jeſuits ſo wreſting from them the ſame doctrine, and Mr. *Baxter* ſo fully anſwered in their anſwer to the Jeſuites that his Reader will not be able to decide which is the verier Jeſuit, he, or thoſe whom he followeth. I had a thought therefore to tranſmit the Reader to the Commentators.

But to manifeſt to the ſimple how little there is in ſubſtance in theſe quoted Scriptures, making for Mr. *Baxter*, I ſhall interpoſe theſe few things.

1 That the Scriptures are all of Gods inſpiration, concenting together in one harmony, no where daſhing either againſt other, no more then God their Author daſheth againſt himſelf: ſo that we muſt neceſſarily conclude that neither all, nor any one of theſe Scriptures doth in its proper and genuine ſenſe, contradict thoſe before alleadged Scriptures of juſtification by faith, and not by works; by faith, without works; by the righteouſneſſe of faith, and not by our own righteouſneſſe; by the law of faith, in oppoſition to the law of works, &c. as before. If then theſe Scriptures ſhould bring in juſtification and remiſſion but in part by our own works and righteouſneſſe, Scripture would here be ſet in commotion againſt Scripture, and God againſt God.

2 Mr. *Baxter* doth here make this work of forgiving and praying for forgiveneſſe, as alſo in the next place all love, obedience, and the works thereof not ſimply conditions of juſtification and forgiveneſſe, (which in ſome ſenſe far from Mr. *Baxters*, ſome of our Theologiſts admit) but collaterally and in

in the ſame relation with faith; and this is the higheſt toppe of Papall preſumption, not the worſt of Jeſuits ſpeak more derogatorily to the depreſſing of Gods grace, or more proudly to the exalting of mans works, worth and righteouſneſſe.

3 From this doctrine of his it would follow that praying and forgiving others muſt be ſuch a condition of juſtification, that where it is there is juſtification, where it is not there is not juſtification, the poſiting or not poſiting of the one including the ſumme of the other: for ſo it is with faith; *He that beleeveth ſhall be ſaved, he that beleeveth not ſhall be damned*, Mark 16.16. ſo Joh. 3.36. Will Mr. *Baxter* ſay ſo of forgiving others, and praying for forgiveneſſe? are all that do it juſtifyed? dares he to ſay it? No otherwiſe, but with his *cæteris paribus*, and *ſenſu compoſito*, if he doth this and all things elſe which a Chriſtian ſhould do. And thus I might alſo make every civill and indifferent Action the condition of juſtification. A mans ſleeping by night, and working by day, his eating when he is hungry, and drinking when he is thirſty, his improving of his grounds before he ſowes them, and ſowing them when improved, and reaping them when the crop is come to maturity; all theſe and the like may be as well called conditions of juſtification, for theſe alſo *cæteris paribus*, when all things elſe are done which a Chriſtian ſhould do, do ſtand as full in ſtrength to juſtification as thoſe works which Mr. *Baxter* particularizeth; yea this *cæteris paribus*, makes ſin, guilt, ungodlineſſe, perdition, &c. more properly conditions of juſtification, then any of thoſe which Mr. *Baxter* nameth; for without the actuall being of thoſe none can be juſtifyed in Chriſt before God: For Chriſt *Came not to call the righteous but ſinners to Repentance*, Mat. 9. 13. *He hath ſhut up all under guilt, under ſin, that the promiſe of righteouſneſſe by the faith of Jeſus Chriſt might be upon all that beleeve*, Rom. 3.19, 22, 23, 24. *He juſtifyeth the ungodly*, Rom. 4. 5. *And ſaveth that which was loſt*, Mat. 18.11. Are theſe duties to be performed coordinately with faith that we may be juſtifyed? ſurely rather then thoſe which Mr. *Baxter* nameth, for theſe ſtill go before, but thoſe of Mr. *Baxter*, (as far as they relate to it) do follow juſtification.

4 The ſcope of theſe Scriptures is to urge upon all that draw near to God in prayer, to purge out all hatred and pur-

poſes of revenge againſt their brethren from their hearts, and the argument by which this duty is preſſed, is, that elſe it (as alſo any other reigning ſin allowed within the heart) will make both their perſons and prayers an abomination to the Lord. God will not hear, will not forgive ſuch as bring, while they bring ſuch a devill in their hearts before him; they ſhall depart without any more anſwer of peace to their ſouls, then they are diſpoſed to give to their brethren againſt whom they are provoked. From theſe Scriptures therefore we may gather how they are qualifyed which are forgiven and juſtifyed, not by what qualifications and works they have obtained juſtification. That whoſoever hath taſted of the pardoning grace of God, the ſame by beholding in Chriſt the *glory of* Gods grace *as in a glaſſe is transformed into the ſame image of grace, love, mercy, goodneſſe, pity*, &c. towards his brethren, as himſelf hath found in God, and ſees ſhining forth upon him from the face of God through Chriſt, 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. That in whomſoever this mercy and goodneſſe of God appears not, whatſoever he boaſteth of faith, and devoutneſſe in prayer, yet it is certain that he is empty of juſtifying faith, and of the juſtification which is by faith: and ſo we have here ſome deſcription of the juſtifyed and unjuſtifyed, not a precept of duties by which the unjuſtifyed may attain to be juſtifyed.

5 The three laſt quotations of Mr. *Baxter*, do ſubvert utterly all that he built by the former quotations: For theſe Scriptures affirming it to be not indefinitely prayer, but *the prayer of faith which ſaveth* and obtaineth forgiveneſſe; that not the *asking ſimply*, but the *asking* of the faithfull *in Chriſts Name* is prevalent; that not every one, but *we* know that whatſoever *we aske we have our petitions granted*; do manifeſt that whatſoever vertue is in prayer it floweth from *faith*, prayer it ſelf is a dead work unleſſe *faith* enliven it, and all our works of mercy and forgiving, dead works, untill *faith* becomes the living root from which they derive life, or rather hath breathed out the life which it hath ſuckt from Chriſt our life into them. That it is *Chriſts name* and mediation that makes all accepted with God, and that not to all, but to thoſe peculiar ones of Chriſt that are in union and conjunction with Chriſt, it being a priviledge peculiar to true beleevers that is here mentioned under the word *we*, we have it (ſaith the Apoſtle) the world hath

no

no part in it. *Eſaus* forgiving, *Sauls* confeſſion of ſin, and *Simon Magus* his prayer for forgiveneſſe, may (as in Mr. *Baxters* laſt quotation *Act.* 8. 22.) *perhaps*, be ſo far heard, and forgiveneſſe obtained from the Lord, as to the exempting of them from ſome temporall vengeance, but not to intereſt them in the juſtification of the Goſpell: If the cryes and workes of any of theſe dogs bring them in to partake of the childrens bread, it is but in mans judgement alone; before God it was their faith and cleaving to Chriſt, yea being in Chriſt by faith, that of dogs made them children, and partakers of the Goſpell priviledges. So theſe Scriptures in no wiſe preſcribe (as I ſaid) the duties by or for which we are, but delineate the Acts and qualifications of thoſe that are juſtifyed by Chriſt.

So much in generall to the ſumme of theſe Scriptures; as for the meaning of the ſeverall Scriptures, and how Mr. *Baxter* argues from them as the Papiſts; how the Sophiſters (for ſo our men fitly tearm the Papiſts) endeavour from them to prove juſtification by works, and the Proteſtants anſwer and confute them; I leave to the Reader to fetch from the Commentators themſelves, whom they ſhall finde to ſpeake fully, as Mr. *Baxter* knoweth but concealeth, not daring to enter the Liſts with them.

The third duty which he brings as coofficiating with faith to juſtification, is a complexion of duties, the whole ſwarm, the vaſt mountain of duties, all that men and Angels can deviſe to be duty: yet that he might declare how he can meaſure and contain ſo huge an Ocean in his fiſt, he cruſheth them ſo together as that they may be held in the concave of two Ingſtels, *love and ſincere obedience, and their works.* Fain would he have followed *Bellarmine* as his ſhaddow at every turne; but he finds his *genius* ſomewhat differing from *Bellarmines*: The Cardinall was for prolixity, Mr. *Baxter* is for brevity. *Bellarmine* puts love in the fourth place as operating to juſtification with faith, and thence proceeds to more. But Mr. *Baxter* follows him here to love, and weary to go after him any further in particulars, ſhakes hands in love with him and parts from him with good leave in reſpect of his method, but in his matter to hold with him throughout the work. Pag. 236.

The firſt Scripture which he quotes is the firſt which *Bellarmine* alleadgeth; thus,

B. *Luk.* 7. 47. (though I knew in *Pinks* interpretation of that.)

It ſeems *Pink* hath given the right interpretation of that Text which all the Proteſtants give. But *Bellarmine* interprets it otherwiſe, and muſt not Chriſt mean as *Bellarmine* will have him? The words of the Text are theſe, *Wherefore I ſay unto thee, her ſins which are many are forgiven, for ſhe loved much: But to whom little is forgiven, the ſame loveth little.* What doth Mr. *Baxter* hence conclude? the ſame with *Bellarmine*, her much love was the ground of the forgiveneſſe of her many ſins, and ſo her love went before her juſtification and forgiveneſſe, which followed as the fruit or conſequent thereof. *Bellarmine* and his fellowrs put authority and holineſſe upon this interpretation, elſe would not Mr. *Baxter* who makes right reaſon the foundation and rule of his Religion, forſwear his wit and reaſon to follow it. For it is evident from the Text to all that are not ſworn enemies to the truth, that the Lord Jeſus reaſoneth here from the effect to the cauſe, and not from the cauſe to the effect: from the womans great love, that many ſins were forgiven her cauſing this love; not from the greatneſſe of her love as from the cauſe why ſo many ſins were forgiven her. So runs the Text, *Which will love moſt, he to whom the creditor hath forgiven* 500. *pence, or he to whom he forgave* 50? The anſwer was, *I ſuppoſe he to whom moſt was forgiven. Thou haſt well ſaid* (ſaith the Lord) ſo it is with this woman, ſhe loves much becauſe much was forgiven her. Who ſees not here the forgiveneſſe to be the cauſe of the love, not the love of the forgiveneſſe? Or will *Bellarmine* which affirmes this woman to be *Mary Magdalen*, or Mr. *Baxter* after him, ſay that while ſhe was yet a Harlot and had ſeven Devils in her, that ſhe loved Chriſt much? how good was it to be poſſeſſed of a whole legion of ſuch white Devils that breathed into the ſoul poſſeſſed, ſuch ſtrong love of Chriſt? But when then ſaid Chriſt to her *Thy faith hath ſaved thee, ver.* 50. did he faith only ſave her, but her love juſtifie her? This is one piece of Mr. *Baxters* new Divinity, and with him I leave it. Let him learn modeſty and truth from *Soarez* himſelf a Prelate among the Papiſts: *Oportet advertere in hoc quod dicitur quoniam dilexit multum: non prius dilexiſſe multum, & magnam dilectionem cauſam fuiſſe tantæ remiſſionis; ſed vice verſa, quoniam remiſſa ſunt ei peccata multa, ideo dixiſſe multum: Soarez in locum.* Vc. 41, &c.

H

He addes *Mat.* 5. 44. *Luk.* 6. 27, 45. *Love your enemies*, &c. *That ye may be the children of your heavenly Father*, &c. What will Mr. *Baxter* hence conclude, but that our love, &c. is the cauſe or ground of our Adoption? That we love God firſt, and then he us afterward? That not his grace but our righteouſneſſe makes us his Children and him our father? But contrariwiſe Chriſt here exhorteth the children to be like the father; directs his words to the already Adopted, ſo to put on the image and reſemble the nature and operations of their heavenly Father, that they may be, *i. e.* declare themſelves to be the children of the heavenly Father. Like that of *Joh.* 13. 35. *By this ſhall all men know that ye are my diſciples if ye love*, &c. And that of 1 *Joh.* 3. 10. *In this the children of God are manifeſt, and the children of the Devill, he that loveth not, is not of God*, &c. So love on our part doth not make but manifeſt us to be the children of God.

But remarkeable is his next quotation *Joh.* 15. 12, 17. *This is my commandement, that ye love one another, ergo* love juſtifyeth; as good as if I ſhould argue, Chriſt commanded *Peter* to angle and take a fiſh: *ergo Peters* angling and catching a fiſh juſtifyed him. As if whatſoever Chriſt commanded, he commanded to juſtification. And as full to his purpoſe is 1 *Cor.* 2. 9. *Eye hath not ſeen nor ear heard*, &c. *what the Lord hath laid up for them that love him: ergo*, my love was the condition of Gods laying up for me: as if God had not laid up for me before I loved him. How agrees this with that which after he annexeth, *Mat.* 25. *Inherit the Kingdome prepared for you before the beginning of the world?* and *Rom.* 8. 28. *All things ſhall work together for good to them that love God*; [who are they?] *ſuch as are called according to his purpoſe*, if called then juſtifyed, and who denyeth the riches of Gods grace diſpenſing all things for the good of his juſtifyed ones that love him? But what is this to loves juſtifying? And rare logick from the next two Scriptures, *Grace be with them that love the Lord Jeſus, Eph.* 6. 24. *And he that loveth him not, let him be Anathema Maranatha*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 22. *Ergo*, love to Chriſt juſtifyeth in rank and life with faith: when I make my love the ground or condition of Gods grace, and ceaſe to make the grace of Chriſt the foundation of my love to Chriſt, then will I expect that Mr. *Baxter* will juſtifie me, untill then I ſhall be in his acount *Anathema maranatha.*

Again,

Again, *God hath promiſed the Crown, the Kingdom to them that love him, Jam.* 1.12.& 2.5.*Ergo*, Juſtification is a Crown and Kingdom, and love will then juſtifie when it brings us to the Crown and Kingdome, untill then we are unjuſtifyed. *He that loveth me ſhall be loved of my Father, Joh.* 14. 21. *Ergo*, our love to Chriſt begets love in the Father, and *ergo*, the love of the Father is our juſtification; and what elſe Mr. *Baxter* will, for he concludes *quidlibet e quolibet. I love them that love me, and they that ſeek me early ſhall finde me, Prov.* 8. 17. *Ergo*, God doth not love us untill we love him, nor ſeek us till we ſeek him, and ſo God is moved by us, not we by him, and perhaps juſtifyed (for of this he ſpeaketh) by us before we are juſtifyed by him. *That I may cauſe them that love me to inherit ſubſtance: and I will fill their treaſures. ver.* 21. *Ergo*; our juſtification is in our cheſts and purſes, and our love prevails upon God and Chriſt to fill them up to the brim with this golden juſtification.

I know not whether I may lawfully follow him in his *non ſequiturs* and playing with the ſacred Oracles of God; ſurely neither *Lucian*, nor *Corn*: *Agrippa* with his Aſſe, could ever treat of holy things more ludibriouſly, or expoſe the ſacred word of God to more ſcorn then this man doth: were it out of weakneſſe that he doth it, he were to be pittied: But who knoweth not if Mr. *Baxter* knoweth not what validity or invalidity there is in every Argument to prove? Where was conſcience then in quoting ſo many Scriptures which are no more proper to prove that to which they are applyed, then they are to demonſtrate a world in the Moon? he knoweth the moſt of them have neither ſound nor ſhew that way, and thoſe that have ſome ſhew have but a ſhew, and being thoroughly urged to his preſent purpoſe would neither prove what he would have here proved, but contrariwiſe cruſh in pieces ſome of his former aſſertions, which are the pillars of the whole ſtructure made in this book, and falling will neceſſitate the ruine of the whole fabrick. All this he ſaw, therefore ſtopped at the quotation, without alleadging or applying the Scriptures quoted. If the man were no more happy in in his Philoſophy then in his Theology, he ſhould have very little thanks from *Rome*. And it is to be doubted his eſteem will be the leſſe there for his pretending to be a Scripturiſt, and over-turning, or at leaſt ſhaming with his fingering of Scriptures, the ſpecious frontiſpice which

which he had erected by his Sophistry. Unlesse possibly this may advantage him that he shewes the same genius and spirit in arguing from Scriptures, with those holy Fathers and Fryers; for so profoundly do we find them arguing, *Thou art Peter and upon this rock*, &c. *Mat.* 16. *Ergo*, the Pope is Christ vicar and vicegerent, &c. Master, or Lord, *Here are two swords, Luk.* 22. 38. *Ergo*, the Pope hath both swords of Ecclesiasticall and Civill power committed to him; *God made two lights, the greater to rule the day, the lesse the night, Gen.* 1. *Ergo*, the Popes power is so much more excellent then Kings and Emperors, as the glory of the Sun surpasseth that of the Moon. *I beat down my body and keep it in subjection*, 1 *Cor.* 9. *Ergo*, we must doe penance, and whip and scourge our backs when there is occcasion. *Every mans work shall be tryed by fire*, 1 *Cor.* 3. *Ergo*, there is a purgatory of fire to be passed thorough after men are dead. With hundreds more of the same kind and worth, wherein it seems Mr. *Baxter* here would imitate them to ingratiate himself into their favour.

As for the residue of Mr. *Baxters* quotations in this place, they are for the most part, if not all, urged in another place, to prove works the condition of our glorification and future salvation, and untill then I forbear to answer them. But lest my in the interim should stand doubting at any of the Scriptures here quoted promising either love, or life, or grace, or glory, to men thus and thus qualifyed, and conceive that such qualifications are the ground and condition together with faith to inright us in that which is promised; I think it fit to premonish by the way (what all Protestant writers have maintained and cleared against the Papists) that the ground of our right in such felicities promised, is not the qualifications or works of the person, but the new relation of the person so qualifyed, his union with Christ, justification and adoption before God. Such promises not being made to all, but to the Saints in Christ so doing; I shall clear it up to you by a similitude. *Isaac* promiseth his son *Esau* his blessing, but bids him go a hunting and bring him venison, and then in eating it, he will blesse him: what was that which enrighted *Esau* to the blessing, that was the ground or condition upon which *Isaac* would blesse him? the venison caught and dressed? nothing lesse; for if a 1000. others should have presented him with a 1000. pieces of venison at severall times, all dressed and fitted to his appetite, the blessing should

have been reſerved entire for *Eſau*, and they all have been ſent away empty; as appeareth by his dealing with *Jacob* preſenting his made veniſon, how agreeing ſo ever the diſh was to the palate of the old Patriark, yet he will examine thorowly who it is, whether his very ſon *Eſau* that brings it, before he gives the bleſſing: It was not then the veniſon, but the ſonſhip, yea primo-geniture of *Eſau* that was the ground and condition of *Iſaacs* promiſe to bleſſe him. So is it alſo to his juſtifyed and adopted ones in Chriſt, that the Lord ſaith, Aske and ye ſhall have, ſeek and ye ſhall finde, knock and it ſhall be opened to you, Run and ye ſhall obtain, Overcome and ye ſhall be crowned, Love and I will love you, Be mercifull and I will be mercifull to you, Humble your ſelves and I will lift you up; and a thouſand more ſuch promiſes of grace, as far as they hold forth ſpirituall and ſaving bleſſings, they are the Childrens bread, diſpenſations of God within his own family; no ſtranger hath part in it, or right to it. Let the world, thoſe that are not beloved, aske, ſeek, knock, run, fight, *&c.* the Lord may poſſibly out of the goodneſſe of his providence, infiniteneſſe of his wiſdome and bounty of his nature, reward with corporall and temporall good things, their carnall and temporall endeavours, but untill by the ſpirit of adoption they are through faith united to Chriſt, they have no right by the new Covenant to make claim to the ſpirituall and ſaving bleſſings promiſed; neither are they any otherwiſe to be ratifyed to any but as they were beloved of God in Chriſt before there were any ſuch qualifications and motions in them, as Mr. *Baxter* cals conditions; as hath been before declared.

Yea ſuppoſe that *Eſau* could not have brought the veniſon to his Father, had been hindered or drawn aſide from ſeeking it, or ſeeking could not find it, or finding could not have taken and brought it; ſhould the promiſe and purpoſe of *Iſaac* to bleſſe him, for this cauſe have failed, He performed not the condition, he ſhall therefore be bereaved of the bleſſing? Nothing leſſe: for the generall and fundamentall ground and condition, the relation of a ſon, of the firſt-born ſon, ſtood ſtill fixed; unto which the good will of the Father, and the bleſſing in the Fathers purpoſe was entailed. In like manner, though a child of God fail in ſome of the works and qualifications which Mr. *Baxter* cals conditions of the new Covenant, yet this makes

not

not the promise of the Covenant, or the beneficence of the Covenanter promising, to be void, because these are grounded, (so far as they are grounded out of God) upon Christ, our union unto Christ, and new relation to God in Christ. All which I doubt not shall be made manifest in its own place; only what hath been said I thought fit to be said by the way, for the prevention of doubts and perplexities that might ingage the weak reader, before we come thither.

I should here have put an end to what I had to say to his first Argument drawn from Scriptures, having spoken to all that in this place are quoted, saving those which he brings again elsewhere, for which place I have put off my examinaion of them: But that *p.* 310. he comes with a new supply. Lest therefore I should make another work of it there, or minister occasion to any of saying that where his Argument is most fortifyed, there I shun and shrink from answering, I shall examine here also what force such of those Scriptures as have not been here quoted and examined, have to prove justification by works; and so much the rather because he tels us there, that the assertion is evident from these following Scriptures.

R. *Mat.* 12. 37. *By thy words thou shalt be justifyed, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.* Justification and Condemnation seem here by our Saviours testimony to depend upon the sinfull and blameless use of our tongues, *Ergo*, upon works.

We may grant all in our Saviours sense without advantaging Mr. *Baxters* cause or endammaging our own. For the Lord Christ here directeth his words to those Legall, Jewish, Pharisaicall Justiciaries who stuck fast to the righteousnesse of the Law for justification, and in zeal thereof blasphemed (as in the precedent part of the Chapter upon which this dependeth is to be seen) Christ and his Gospell. This blasphemy Christ here reproveth and smiteth with a weapon fetcht out of their own Armory: Even your own law forbids such evill words and blasphemies, holding forth Justification and Condemnation not only upon condition of good and evill works but words also, so that there is nothing spoken of the justification of the New but of the Old Covenant only. A reprehension and commination pat to them to whom it was denounced, the threat of the Law to

them that refused the Gospell, and were and would be under the Law. But this is nothing to the justification of the new Covenant, that followes the rule of the Gospell.

The next Scripture not contained and examined in the former sardle of quotations is,

B. 1 *Joh.* 1. 9 *If we confesse our sins, God is faithfull to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from our iniquities.* Here confession another work seems to be a condition of forgiveneſſe and justification.

1 If we look strictly to the words, Mr. *Baxter* must hence argue only, that our confession is a condition of Gods faithfulneſſe, as if God either cannot or will not be faithfull except we confeſſe. But let us give Mr. *Baxter* the largeſt advantage that he can claim in the meaning of the words, that God is positively and not hypothetically or conditionally faithfull; and that of his faithfulneſſe he will forgive and cleanſe, if we confeſſe. In this ſenſe, then whereas the Apoſtle ſpeaketh affirmatively not negatively, (if we confeſſe he will forgive; not, if we confeſſe not, he will not forgive) I do

2 Demand whether confeſſion be ſo a condition of forgiveneſſe that whoſoever confeſſeth ſhall be forgiven. This Mr. *Baxter* will not affirme, without his *cæteris paribus*, whereof the Text ſpeaks not a word, expreſly or implicitely for him, and if he conclude negatively he concludes not from the Text but his own fancie.

Obj. But if you deny forgiveneſſe upon confeſſion made, you deny what the Text affirmeth and ſo fight againſt the word it ſelf, denying what it clearly affirmeth.

Anſw. True, if we deny it to them to whom the Text grants and promiſeth it: But the Apoſtle ſpeaks here not to the unjuſtifyed and unforgiven, but to the Sants forgiven and juſtifyed already, and the Emphaſis of the propoſition or promiſe is in the word *we*, if *we* that are in Chriſt confeſſe, God will hold faithfull in keeping Covenant with us, and forgive. So that this is a conſolation to the Saints againſt all their dayly infirmities. They have a priviledge above all the world beſides, *If they ſin they have an advocate with the Father*, &c. through whom when they confeſſe and bewail their ſins, the grace of God will by his Spirit teſtifie and ſeal to their conſciences the forgiveneſſe of them.

3 To

3 To descend without the Text to Mr. *Baxters conditio sine qua non*, there must be more then a grain of salt to make his assertion savory, that without confession there is no forgivenesse. For if by it he mean that of the Apostle, Confession with the mouth, he shall exclude many thousands from justification whom the Scripture excludeth not.

4 I grant to Mr. *Baxter* that some of our Divines have affirmed (though I fear somewhat rawly and inconsiderately) that confession is a condition *sine qua non*, of forgivenesse, yet far from Mr. *Baxters* sense; *viz.* with these three limitations whereof Mr. *Baxter* will not endure the test.

1 Of the forgivenesse which is by the new Covenant, or as it is declared and sealed up to our consciences; Not of the forgivenesse which was laid up in the hands as laid up in the hands of Christ, and ours in him before we beleeved or confessed.

2 Such a condition as is not in the same relation with this, as Mr. *Baxter* makes it: the very naming whereof they count as absolutely contradicting the nature and authority of the Gospell.

3 Such a condition as explodes the *ceteris paribus & sensu communi* of Mr. *Baxter* so that though they speak somewhat of Mr. *Baxters* words, yet they are at a defiance against his sense and meaning. How and in what sense they will have it a condition, is no place here to treat. It hath been a digression to say any thing of it, because it is utterly besides the Text to which alone here I was to speak.

Act. 8. 22. *Repent of this thy wickednesse, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee.*

This Scripture I passed by in the former heap of his quotations, as possibly a mistake in the quotation; but finding it here again, and afterward in a third place, I see the man means as he writeth, and cannot enough marvell what he can fish from this Scripture to prove any thing of mans works a condition of justification. If the word [If] here make or argue a condition, it must be on Gods not on mans part, that man must repent and pray upon condition that God will forgive, else not, if forgivenesse be not the *causa sine qua non* of repentance and

prayer. But this is nonsense to have God upon terms, if he will have any duty from us. He must therefore mean on the other side, God will forgive upon condition of prayer and repentance. But how he will perswade this Scripture to say it, it past my capacity to comprehend. Here is no promise (himself grants there is but an half-promise) of forgiving on Gods part [*Append. pag.* 79.] and nothing mentioned as a condition on mans part. But contrariwise duties of naturall righteousnesse commanded or counselled to a naturall man, upon such cold encouragement as the Scripture affords to the carnall devotions of carnall men carnally performed; If perhaps the thoughts of thy heart may be forgiven. If Mr. *Baxters* Assertions be but so sound as his Arguments, neither will serve for good Bell-mettall.

B. *Act.* 3. 19, *Repent and be converted, that your sinns may be blotted out, &c.*

How far repentance is a condition hath been discoursed of and discussed already.

B. *Act.* 22. 16. *Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the* Lord.

Is then Baptism a condition so necessary that without it there is no washing away of sin? And must the Popish Tenet be found writren in Mr. *Baxters* Calender with red letters *Sacramenta opere operato conferunt gratiam?* or doth Baptism prove ineffectuall to all that do not, cannot, call upon the name of the Lord? Then whether Mr. *Baxter* be more against himself or against the Protestant Churches, who can decide? More modestly speaks even *Bellarmine*, which makes the desire of receiving the Sacraments a condition of justification, expelling from forgivenesse them that desire them not; this man rigorously and cruelly shakes into condemnation those that do not, because they have not opportunity to receive them though their desire be unfeigned: or if he doth not so, this Scripture proves not Baptism to be the condition *sine qua non*. As for calling upon the name of the Lord I have before spoken to.

B. I P

1 Pet. 4. 18. *If the righteous be scarce saved, where shall the wicked and ungodly appear?*

I should be in a Labyrinth of doubts how he would argue hence for himself, were it not that elsewhere he explaineth himself in his book, thus, If the righteous be scarce saved by all their strivings, how shall they be saved that strive not at all? We deny not the duty of striving in holy things, yea of striving for salvation; though in Mr. *Baxters* sense we deny it: Yet the meaning of this Text as appears by its dependence upon the verse precedent, is, If the corruptions and unbelief of heart be so great in the very Saints and beleevers, that they must passe through the purifying fire of Gods judgments more and more to perfect them before they be made vessels of honour in the Kingdome of glory; or that they need the scourge of Gods correction to whip them back to Christ, that they perish not by following their own thoughts: What then shall become of the wicked, which are wholly full of corruption and unbeleef, without any spark of faith, and whom the Lord hath given up to a spirit of slumber, like Bastards without all Chastisements hindering, to roll themselves into mine?

Rom. 6. 16. *His servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousnesse.*

The Apostle here speaketh of the righteousnesse (not of Justification but) of Sanctification, except we will say, he here digresseth from that which he makes the subject of this whole Chapter. But whether he means the righteousnesse of justification or of sanctification, yet the obedience he here speaketh of is that which *cap. 1. ver. 5.* he declares himself to have received commission and Apostleship to preach, *viz.* obedience to the faith, the same whereof is faith in Christ Jesus.

What he would infer from his two last quotations, 1 *Pet.* 4. 2. 22. Let him that can understand, declare and make answer to it. I yeeld that his profoundnesse condemns my shallowness. I dare not contradict him in what he would, because I have not the wit to imagin what he would say. It seems he had de-

determined such a number of quotations, and took at adventur
those that came next to his view to make up that preci
number. Any other Scriptures besides these being (as to m
apprehension) no lesse pat and proper to his purpose the
these.

Chap. IV.

The vanity and ridiculousnesse of Mr. Baxters *second a
third Arguments discovered: The former that, Beca
faith is the more principall, and works the lesse pri
pall condition of our Justification; and that all oth
duties are in some respect or other, reducible to fait
therfore we may be said to be justifyed by other wor
and duties, yet to be justifyed by faith alone. Th
second drawn from a wide and irregular definition
faith that it containeth all works in its belly, therefo
whosoever is justifyed by those works, is justifyed by fai
only.*

A second Argument he drawes from an anticipation of a objection, which he prevents by turning the edge of against the objectors and applying it to the strengthening his own assertion. The objection that he sees in readine against him, is, that this doctrine of justification by duties a works, wholly overthroweth that highest and most fundame tall Gospel doctrine of justification by faith alone. This he deni and affirmes *Thes.* 62. *p.* 238. that although we be justifyed by thousand duties besides,

B. *Yet faith may be called the only condition of the New Covenant*, i. e. *justification.*

True, if Mr. *Baxter* give the denomination, but the question not, what things may be called, but what they are. A w

is pronounced to them that call or put light for darkneſſe, and darkneſſe for light, good for evill, and evill for good, &c. I ſhall no further preſſe the unaptneſſe of the phraſe, Mr. *Baxter*, declaring in that which followeth, his meaning to be, that faith may be the only condition notwithſtanding; which he proves thus,

B. 1 *Becauſe it is the principall condition, and the other but the leſſe principall. And as the whole countrey hath oft its name from the chief City; ſo may the conditions of this Covenant from faith.*

2 *Becauſe all the reſt are reducible to it; either being preſuppoſed as neceſſary antecedents as means, or contained in it as its parts, properties or modifications, or elſe implyed as its immediate products or neceſſary ſubſervient means or conſequents.*

I ſpeak firſt to the latter of theſe two arguments, becauſe he ſpeaks firſt in the explication to the confirmation of it. It is almoſt as wiſe an argumentation as I knew once uſed by ſome home-bred, courſe-ſpun ſons of a Country farmer, who having heard that their father upon a day was ſworn Conſtable at the Court, made merry at home, concluding from their fathers Conſtableſhip that they were all Conſtables and muſt rule the Pariſh, becauſe they were his ſons and dwelt in houſe with him: or as that of the Athenian boy that boaſted himſelf to be the ruler of Athens, thus proving it, that he ruled his mother, and his mother ſwayed his father, and his father being Lord Maior that year ſwayed Athens. Yea more of reaſon, at leaſt leſſe of reaſonleſneſſe is there in both theſe arguings, then in that of Mr. *Baxter*; theirs concluded only the ſons to partake neceſſarily of their fathers office: this man makes all that are in any reſpect of kindred, yea of any relation to faith for ſuch their relation to partake of the office of faith to juſtifie. For ſo he reaſoneth, all the reſt are reducible to faith as Antecedents [going before it] means [to obtain it] or parts, or properties, or neceſſary adjuncts and modifications, or products [effects] or conſequents. What then? *Ergo*, theſe all in regard of their alliance or affinity to faith, juſtifie and bear a part with faith in its office of juſtifying. And yet when theſe juſtifie as much as faith, we muſt underſtand that faith juſtifyeth alone:

Becauſe what all theſe allies of faith do, that faith it ſelf may be ſaid to do. This is indeed Logick to prevail with his *Kederminſterians*, or rather ſuch of them as know no difference between Logick and Garlick. It is as if I ſhould diſpute thus, God made choyce of *David* before all and any other of the ſons of *Abraham* to be King and to rule over *Iſrael*; therefore all the progenitours of *David* as well *Tamar*, and *Ruth*, and *Rahab*, as *Judah*, *Pharez* and *Booz*, yea more ſpecially *Jeſſe* the father of *David*, and all the brethren of *David*, yea all the ſons and generation of *David* to *Joſeph* the Carpenter; (let me dilate my ſelf more boldly) all the tribe of *Judah*, which were fleſh of his fleſh, and bone of his bone; nay all *Iſrael* which were allies to him, and met with him in one common father *Jacob*; theſe all partaked of *Davids* kingſhip, and were partners with him in the office of ruling, becauſe they all were one way or other reducible to *David* as going before him, or following him, *&c.* and yet when all theſe were Kings with *David*, nevertheleſſe *David* was King alone. Or thus, The eye only of all the members of the body is appointed to the office of ſeeing, nevertheleſſe the head that holds and gives influence to it, the eye-lids that cover it, the veins that convey nutriment to it, the cheeks, noſe, lips, and teeth that are contiguous to it, the hands and feet that are guided by it, *&c.* all theſe and many more do partake of the office of ſeeing together with the eye, and when all theſe do ſee as well as the eye, yet the eye doth ſee alone, becauſe all the reſt are reducible in ſome way of alliance to the eye. If Mr. *Baxters* diſpute be not one and the ſame with this in its grounds, then is all my reaſon gone out of my head into my cap. And at ſuch arguing, *Agelaſtus* that laught only once (when he ſaw his horſe eat Thiſtles) would be tickled into a ſecond laughter.

And no more weight is there in his former reaſon, Becauſe faith is the principall condition and the other leſſe principall. And as a whole County, *&c.* Here

1 I would demand in what reſpect according to Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Baxter* can make faith the more principall, and the reſt qualifications and duties the leſſe principall conditions. Not in reſpect of their nature, for if one be, all are ſpirituall and Divine. Nor in reſpect of priority in time, for if not all yet many of the reſt are of the ſame age and birth with faith. Nor in reſpect

respect of durance, for many of them survive faith as justifying. Nor in its instrumentality to justification, for he denyeth any such thing to be in faith. Nor in office, for in it he confounds all together. Nor in the amplitude of its object, for herein love as in other things requires the preeminency. Nor in order of operation, for he makes many of them Antecedents to faith. Nor in the perfection of its effect, for he affirmes the rest to perfect what faith hath but begun. In what respect then is faith the more principall? Mr. *Baxter* shewes not, because according to his principles, it is beyond my principles to conceive that he can shew. Yet he saith it because it serves his turn here to say it; degrading faith at one place, and enthroning it in another at his pleasure, for his own ends.

2 But if it be the principall condition, &c. what will follow hence for Mr. *Baxters* advantage? This he makes to follow, *That as the whole Country hath oft its name from the chief city, so may the rest duties from faith:* why doth he not speak plain? it may be, saith he; but is it so? where doth the Scripture give this name to faith it self? much lesse to other duties in faith implyed? Neither is the question about the name but the offices of all these. It is rare that the Country takes its name from the chief City; yet this is not in question, but whether the whole Country partake of the priviledges and charter of the chief City. This may indeed be, where potentates that have the absolute Lordship of both, grant to both the same priviledges. Yet then the priviledges and dignities of the chief City are not its alone being common to the whole Country with it.

3 But to the very thing in hand without painting and dawbing; When the Lord hath rejected *Mizpah, Shiloh, Dan, Bethel,* and all other the Cities and Country of *Israel* saving *Jerusalem* alone there to vouchsafe his presence and to be sought unto; it is then a rejection of God, to set up Gods name and worship elsewhere saving at, and equalize any other place with *Jerusalem* the *Metropolis*. Hence is that complaint of God, *Israel hath forsaken his maker and buildeth temples*. So when God hath consecrated faith alone and qualifyed it for the receiving of Christ to justification, having rejected all our own righteousnesse and works from being priviledged together with it to this office and worke; it is no lesse then a forsaking of God and of Christ to performe the most holy duties or to produce Hos. 8.14.

the moſt Celeſtiall qualifications in the leaſt part to juſtifie us.

4 All that Mr. *Baxter* dares to conclude hence is, that works and duties may be, not that they are, conditions of juſtification. But how from theſe reaſons he will bring about that theſe all are the conditions, or condition, and yet faith the alone condition, if he had ſo many eyes as *Argus*, to guide him, and ſo many hands as *Briareus* to work with by that guidance, he ſhall be never able to effect.

Yet in the explication *pa.* 239. Mr. *Baxter* to charme his overly reader into a deluſion, pretends a proof of this *Theſis* by two ſimilitudes, which I forbear to tranſcribe becauſe they are not worthy of ſo much labour. For

Firſt, Similies do illuſtrate not prove. He ſhould firſt have proved, and then illuſtrated.

Secondly, They are not adequate or fitted to the queſtion, ſpeak only to a part of, and not to the whole *Theſis*, conclude at the beſt only that faith may in ſome caſe imply many other duties, but in no wiſe that when faith is ſaid to juſtifie, other duties are implyed under the word faith as juſtifying together with it; much leſſe that all other duties juſtifie, yet faith alone juſtifyeth. If he would reaſon by them home to his poſition, he muſt reaſon to this Tenour.

In the former, ſuppoſe a King or State give to me by commiſſion the government of ſuch an eminent City or Caſtle, but with this *proviſo* and upon theſe articles, that I disband the Army by which before I laid ſiege to it, remove from me all my Regiments, quit my ſelf of all my Souldiers, and ſo enter into the poſſeſſion and government, and all the honour and profits thereof, by my ſelf alone and one Counſellour to ſerve and aſſiſt me in the managing of the ſaid government: If now by vertue of this Commiſſion I enter, not having disbanded the ſaid Army, but carry it in with me, ſome under a pretenſe of guarding my perſon, others as my individuall adherents from whom I cannot be ſeparated, others to retain the Citizens within the bounds of due loyalty to me, and the reſt under a pretext of propagating the dominion of that power that hath ſo inveſted me with the government: No man will doubt but I enter as a Traytor, not as a loyall Truſtee to the power which hath deputed me. Who will not laugh at it as a ſophiſticall or rather ridi-

ridiculous plea, when he hears me maintaining that I entred with that one Counseller alone, for all the rest are implyed in him, some as his right, some as his left hand, some his parents, some his children, some his friends, some his servants, &c. and so I have but him alone in having so many thousands with him? So the new Covenant gives me Christ with justification and blessednesse in him, with this Commission and proviso, that I disband my own strength and righteousnesse, the whole Army of my works by which before I laid siege to it, to make all mine by my own winning, and to enter into possession with faith alone apprehending all from the hand of free grace. Shall I not be a Traytor if I carry the whole Army of works to take and hold possession for me, though I make never so golden a pretext of faith only, to which all these are reducible.

The same is the tenour of the redemption of the galley slave, if you will not run from the Scripture in stead of following it in making comparisons. But unto it I shall have a more proper place to speak afterward, when we come to Mr. *Baxters* great adored Argument of receiving Christ as our Lord as well as Saviour; or if there be not occasion offered there, in the interim the slaves future service is not a condition but a consequent of his present redemption.

But let us see now whether Mr. *Baxter* with this paint of that which he cals right Reason, do fight against God or Man, doth resist the placits of men, or else the holy Ghost himself. He required before that all might be tryed by Scriptures. Let us now bring his doctrine to the touch-stone. I shall not repeat all or any of the Scriptures before alleadged, or that might be further alleadged against him. One arrow out of that holy quiver, one Scripture out of the whole body of Gospell doctrine shall suffice to smite to the heart, to death it self, all that he goeth about here with fine flourishes of wit to establish. *Eph.* 2. 8, 9, 10. thus speaks the holy Ghost, *By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of your selves, it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast: For ye are Gods workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.*

That the word Saved is an equipollent here with Justifyed, if

there ſhould be any that will deny, yet Mr. *Baxter* will and muſt affirme, unleſſe he will beat in pieces one of the chief pillars of the fabrick erected in this book, and overthrow what he hath built. In this truth he muſt joyn with us, though in other he eſtrange himſelf from us. The ſame Act of God being called juſtifying as it diſchargeth us from the ſtate of our miſery as conſidered to be a ſtate of ſin: and ſaving as it delivereth us from it under the conſideration of it as a ſtate of condemnation and vengeance. Mr. *Baxter* will grant, cannot but grant this. And then there will naturally drop from this Scripture theſe following poſitions.

1 That the juſtification or ſalvation of the Covenant of grace is by faith.

2 That it is not of works, but by faith in oppoſition to works.

3 That the very works which flow from our union to Chriſt, and to which we are new created in Chriſt Jeſus, even thoſe which Mr. *Baxter* calleth the righteouſneſſe of the Goſpell, are excluded from bearing any part with faith in our juſtification.

4 That the not juſtification by works doth in no wiſe hinder the beleevers performing of them, for they are created in Chriſt Jeſus, their hearts are new wrought by the Spirit to a holy delight in them.

5 That God hath not ordained them to juſtifie, but for the new created and juſtifyed in Chriſt to walk in them.

6 That to teach otherwiſe of works, the very works of Sanctification, is to depreſſe Gods grace, and to extoll mans boaſting and vain-glory.

7 Even theſe goſpell works and righteouſneſſe are excluded from having any part in juſtifying not only as collaterals with the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, but alſo as collaterals with faith, *i.e.* from bearing a part either in cauſality or conditionality with faith to juſtifie.

I challenge Mr. *Baxter* and all his Legall and Anti-evangelicall diſciples here to deny any one of theſe poſitions to ſpring naturally from this Text. And if the the holy Ghoſt here ſpeak all this, then by it all that Mr. *Baxter* ſpeaketh throughout this whole Tractate for juſtification by works is by the breath of God

Gods mouth blown to the curse, as in many things I shall by Gods help shew afterward.

At the present what he speaketh of works comprehended in faith to justification is here shaken off as a Sophisticall, phantasticall, Antiscripturall dream, the holy Ghost here by the positing of faith, in expresse words rejecting works, Gospell works, all that Mr. *Baxter* makes a part with faith in that which he cals Evangelicall righteousnesse, from all and any copartnership with faith in saving or justifying; so excludes all, as that he denyeth that justification by grace can any more stand, if the best Gospell works of the best Saints are put in any cooperation with faith in the promoting of it.

All the rest that he hath in the explication *pa.* 240. and thence to *pa.* 243. is wholly besides the question, which is not whether works and duties be reducible to faith, or in what respect every particular qualification and duty standeth to it. But whether reduced or not reduced, it doth by Gods appointment help with faith to justify us before God. This we have found to be an usuall feat of Mr. *Baxter*, where his assertions are confident and peremptory, but his proofs of them light and shadie, to devise in such case some witty passage wherewith to divert the considerations of his reader, from the shame and nakednesse of his foregoing Arguments. And this most probably was his drift and craft here, having given us but words in stead of Arguments to prove that works are comprehended and implied in faith, in all such Scriptures as attribute justification to faith only; that the emptinesse and nothingnesse of his argumentation to make this good may not appear to the reader, he tols him away to attend to a subtle and plausible dispute, of the relation that every good endowment and work hath particularly to faith. In which discourse of his we will not examine how many things are true and how many false; for if they were all true they are uothing to the thing in question; *viz.* whether in the severall relations that Mr. *Baxter* makes them to stand to faith, or in any other they help with faith to justification, and that so, as that when all these with faith cojustifie, we may be yet said to be justifyed by faith alone. When he hath spoken all by meer affirming without confirming, he thus indeed at last concludeth, *pa.* 243.

B. *So then when you invite a man to your house, it is not necessary to bid him come in at the door; or bring his head, or arms, or legs, or cloathes with him (though these are necessary) because all these are necessarily implyed: Even so when we are said to be justifyed by faith only; or when it is promised that he which beleeveth shall be saved, all these forementioned duties are implyed and included.*

How ecliptick is falshood, but sincerity open and full? No man invites another to his house but to some end, either to taste of some dainties, or hear some good tidings, or see some excellent work, or for some other end. He should have named the end, and we would grant him all; thus, that as much as the door, head, legs, armes, clothes of the invited, do partake with the mouth in the act of tasting, or with the eye in seeing, or the ear in hearing: so much when we are invited to Christ, do other duties and workes partake with faith in receiving him to justification.

A third argument (if indeed it be not one and the same in substance, and differ only in words from the former) he draweth from a wide, wilde, vast, confused and incircumscriptive definition of faith, begotten of his own brain, and now first as an overgrown monster born into the world, and baptized by the father of it with the name of justifying faith. This definition he giveth, *Thes.* 70. *pa.* 279. I put this in the third place, not because Mr. *Baxter* doth so, (for he hath many things between the former and this) but because of its cognation, if not identity with the former.

No doubt he saw the former argument more to shame then help his cause, therefore in likelihood he brings it here again in another mode and forme, if so paradventure it may relieve him. Thus then runs his definition.

B. *Faith in the largest sense as it comprehendeth all the condition of the new Covenant, may be thus defined: It is when a sinner by the word and spirit of Christ, being throughly convinced of the righteousnesse of the Law, the truth of its threatning, the evill of his own sin, and the greatnesse of his misery hereupon, and withall of the nature and office sufficiency and excellency of Jesus Christ, the satisfaction he hath made, his willingnesse to save, and his free offer to all that will accept him for their Lord and Saviour, doth hereupon beleeve the truth*

his Gospell, and accept of Christ as his onely Lord and Saviour, to bring them to God their chief good, and to present them pardoned and just before him, and to bestow upon them a more glorious inheritance, and doe accordingly rest on him as their Saviour, and sincerely (though imperfectly) obey him as their Lord, forgiving others, loving his people, bearing what sufferings are imposed, diligently using his means and ordinances, and confessing and bewailing their sins against him, and praying for pardon, and all this sincerely, and to the end.

Sponte Cretizantem quis neget esse Cretem?

Never more dubiousnesse in the most dubious Oracles of *Apollo Delphicus*, then in this definition, if indeed it be a definition, because Mr. *Baxter* so calleth it. He so speaks all, that by all he might astonish some and deceive others, yet if he be questioned, his words bind him to nothing, but that he may goe off and on at his pleasure. The *subtilissimus* Doctor could not more warily have provided himself with evasions so sure that if all the world together should indeavour it, none can catch him.

1 If we demand of him whether he speak of faith *qua Justificat*, & *qua Justificat*, which Justifyeth, and as it Justifyeth? he leaves us here at a losse, and will not tell us.

2 In saying, Faith as it comprehendeth all the condition, &c. and by all the condition understanding all the duties which the Law requireth, if he be demaunded whether there be a faith which comprehendeth all these? or if so, whether as parts of it self or things reducible to it? or if the latter, why are all these, or how, more comprehended in faith, then faith and all other of the rest (in his *sensu composito*) comprehended in any one of the rest? or if in the former sense, whether it be a faith of Gods making, or of Mr. *Baxters* making, made in the defining, and defined in the making? To no one of these our doubts that he leaves upon us by his ambiguity of speaking, hath he one word to resolve us; so that where to finde an answer to him he leaves us uncertain.

3 If we should aske him [where he saith in the beginning of the definition, *It is when a sinner*, &c.] whether he means that

the *quando* is the *genus* of faith? or whether it be a regular definition of an act or habit to posit when it is, and not what it is? and if so, why doth he not define it by a certain rather then by an indefinite time, by *Anno Mundi*, or *Anno Domini*, or *Imperii*, or *Regni*, &c. that from the Chronicle we may seek and finde it? Or if by his *quando* we can find out the time, how shall we find and know the thing? Be it that we can hit the time when all that followeth is done, and so upon Mr. *Baxters* authority conclude that *then faith is*, yet do we not remain so uncertain as at first, *what it is*, that we may make use of it to justification? he speaks nothing to certifie us; that from what he saith, we might take the occasion to consent with him or dissent from him.

4 If we would know from him of all those things at whose being, positure and acting, he tels us faith is, whether they include faith constitutively, or else but declaratively, whether faith consists of these, as the whole of its parts, or the genus of its species, or the compound of its simples; or else whether all these do but declare and evidence the truth of faith in a man? If declaratively alone, how then do those things which only declare faith, any more then declare and evidence Justification by faith? and how then holds his conclusion hence, that we are justifyed before God by these, because so justifyed by faith? Or if constitutively as many severall parts and ingredients, they make up (as it were the body of) faith; how then doth the holy Ghost oppose faith and works, even to the excluding either of other, (about the point of justifying) as in other Scriptures, so in that before mentioned Text, *Eph.* 2. 8, 9, 10. Is there a conflict of flesh and spirit, *Jacob* and *Esau*, *Christ* and *Baxter*, in one and the same body and bowels of faith, either to destroy the other [as to Justification?] or if faith be made up of works, and the holy Ghost doth so frequently in Scripture reject, yea accurse works from the justification of the new Covenant, how is not faith it self which is nothing else but a body and bundle of works, accursed from justification also? In none of these ambiguities that he hath left in his *Thesis*, doth he speak one word to satisfie us.

Lastly, where he saith that faith is, when all these duties are done, *sincerely to the end*, if we demand him whether he mean that when there is an end of doing them, or of the man that doth

doth them, that then faith hath its being and not till then, and so all other duties act in justifying while we live, and faith after all when we are dead? or whether he means that as long as these duties are done, faith is; but when they are not done, or when they cease to act, faith is not, but loseth its being: *Fuit Ilium & ingens gloria Teucrorum*; I had once a faith and a ravishing joy in beleeving, either while I was under sufferings for Christs sake, but now my sufferings are ended, and I am no more persecuted, my faith is expired; or while I waited on all the ordinances of Christ: but now my sick bed, or prison, or banishment, intercepts me from many of Christs ordinances, My faith is lost? which of these wayes, or in what third sense he will be understood, let him that can conjecture; but in respect of any thing that we have under his hand in the Thesis, he is yet free to choose his meaning; so that in all that he saith here, he hath armed himself against all exceptions, by saying it so that we shall not know his meaning. Only thus far we may speak with *Augustine*, *Si non vis intelligi debes negligi.* What is not an understandable Argument, we shall contemn as no Argument.

But his illustration and proof may possibly follow in his Explication. Thither also we will follow him to examine which one of all these things delivered here so ambiguously, he doth there plainly illustrate or prove, it runnes thus, *pa.* 281.

B. *This is the condition of the New Covenant at large: That all this is sometime called faith, as taking its name from the primary, principall, vitall part, is plain hence.*

Of the condition enough hath been said before, we look for proof. That all this is sometime called [I mean in Gods not Mr. *Baxters* Scriptures] faith, we also will say it is plain, if he make it plain by his. *Hence, viz.*

B. 1. *In that faith is oft called* [*obeying of the Gospell*] *but the Gospell commands all this, Rom.* 10. 16. 1 Pet 1. 22. & 4. 17. 2 *Thess.* 1. 8. *Gal.* 3. 1. & 5. 7. *Heb.* 5. 9.

1 In all these Scriptures obeying of the Gospell is one and the same thing which in other Scriptures is called the obedience of faith, *i. e.* obedience to that Gospell doctrine which requireth

to reſt upon Chriſt alone by faith for righteouſneſſe and life without any intermixture to attain the ſame, called obedience to the Goſpell, to diſtinguiſh between the Goſpell and Legall way of juſtification. This Mr. *Baxter* knoweth well, therefore he gives us the quotation without the words of theſe Texts, moſt of them being ſuch, as if there were nothing elſe ſaid in the whole Word, even theſe are enough to ſubvert as pernicious his aſſertion.

2 The thing in queſtion is not whether the Goſpell command theſe duties, but whether it commands us to do them that we may be juſtifyed by ſuch deeds? and whether becauſe the Goſpell commands them, it doth therefore call them faith? or that all which is to be done in obedience to the Goſpell, is ſtraightway to take up either the Nature or Name of faith?

3 How doth he contradict himſelf here, in what he had ſaid before, *Theſis* 31. *pa.* 154. where he affirmed the Commandements of the Goſpell (in relation to theſe duties) to be the eſtabliſhment of the Morall Law, and the perfect obedience in the Law commanded; and that this is but an adjunct of the new Covenant [or Goſpell] and not a proper part thereof? Will he ſay then that all the works which the Morall Law commandeth are faith? or by the Goſpell Metamorphoſed from works into faith?

B. *The fulfilling of the conditions of the new Covenant, is oft called faith,* &c.

But theſe forementioned are parts of the condition of the new Covenant; Ergo, *they are implyed and included in faith*, *Gal.* 3. 12, 23, 25.

A wretched Argument lame in every foot, in which one principle is begged to maintain another. Neither of the premiſes nor yet the concluſion, having any ſoundneſſe either as they are conſidered a part, or all together. Or if he could have proved either propoſition from Scripture, would he have ſuffered them to paſſe under his bare affirmation alone? The Scriptures annexed prove only an oppoſition between faith and works, the Goſpell and the Law; but are as far as heaven from earth, from proving either of the premiſes. Neither doth the concluſion infer what it ſhould from the premiſes, *i. e.* what is contained in them. I ſhould in particulars ſhew the deformed nakedneſſe of the Syllo-

Syllogiſm, if it did not enough ſhew it ſelf without my help. How rotten muſt the cauſe needs be, which puts ſo profound a man to ſuch miſerable ſhifts, and abſurd arguings, to defend it where there is no oppoſer?

What followes in the ſame Section, is all one as if he had ſaid, not ſo, but ſo, *&c.* becauſe I have over and over told you ſo, and what I have told you muſt needs be true.

The other things in the explication are not to this queſtion.

Leſt any ſhould except that I wrong Mr. *Baxter* in calling theſe two latter, his ſecond and third Arguments [to prove juſtification by works] when he doth not ſo call them, though he doth ſo uſe them: I have proſecuted the matter of them wholly as conſidered in it ſelf, without any further reference to the concluſion, then as himſelf in expreſſe words applies them to it.

CHAP. V.

The fourth and great Argument of Mr. Baxter *examined, and the inference, that becauſe Chriſt as Lord as well as Saviour is the object of juſtifying faith, as juſtifying, therefore we are juſtifyed by works as well as by faith, is confuted. And withall proved that Chriſt as our Lord dying for us, and not as Lord and a Lawgiver is the object of faith as juſtifying. Mr.* Baxters *Reaſons to prove the contrary, anſwered.*

HIS fourth Argument is drawn from the Object of Faith, and the due qualification of the ſame Object. It runnes thus, as by his diſputes compacted and compared together, appeareth.

1. *If Chriſt be the object of juſtifying faith, as ſuch, not only in his Prieſtly office, as our Redeemer and Saviour, but alſo in his Kingly office as our Lord and Ruler, then other works and duties of obedience are as much required as faith in juſtifying us before God.*

But Christ is the object of justifying faith as such, not only in his Priestly but also in his Kingly office, as our Lord as well as our Redeemer and Saviour; Ergo, *other works and duties of obedience have so much to do in justifying as faith.* [*He saith affiance, which whether it at all differs from faith, and whether he means not the same with faith we shall see afterward, if it be necessary.*]

The Assumption he layes down and goes about to prove *Thes.* 66. and in its explication beginning *pa.* 255. The consequent of the proposition he hath and endeavours to confirme in and under *Thes.* 72, 73.

This one of all his Arguments hath the Dominicall letter on it; it is the *wood*, the rest are but the *hay and stubble* of his building his *sacra anchora*, if this hold not, the man with his vessell, and all the trash-treasure therein must perish upon the Rocks. All the rest of his Arguments are but bubbles in comparison of this bottle-glasse. Therefore he attributes much to this, gloryeth in it, and only doth not fall down and worship it. It was hinted before here and there in all his discourse, but here he manageth it with all his strength and art.

I shall speak first to the Assumption, because he first puts and endeavours to prove it. And here now appears what his end was in laying a third opinion of the righteousnesse of Christ to justification, besides the active and passive righteousnes: *viz.* righteousnesse meritorious for us, and not imputed to us; after he had been 10. years for the passive righteousnesse only, as he notifies to us, *pa.* 54, 55. The ground it seems of altering his judgment is, because that opinion would not subserve to his justification by works; which he hath so pertinaciously determined to set up, that whatsoever of sacred or humane Authority he meets with opposit to it he shoulders it out of the way; and whatsoever occurres out of any sink and puddle making for it, he takes up as a treasure. But the Meritoriousnesse of Christs Legislative and Kingly office to satisfie for our sins, being laid as a groundwork, he thought (it seems) would tend much to the exalting of the works done by the Commandement of King Jesus, to justification: therefore he took it up from *Grotius* and made use of it as a paved way to Justification by works which here almost from the same grounds he urgeth. And so we see that from the very beginning to the end of this Tractate, all that he hath, conspireth and aspireth to this end

and [justification by works,] and to elude all that the Gospell hath against it.

But let us come to examine his Assumption to this Argument and what he brings for it.

B. *Thes. 66. Christ is not in any one part or work of his office alone, the object of justifying faith, as such; but Christ in his entire office considered, is this object.* viz. *as he is Redeemer, Lord, and Saviour.*

In a good sense we might grant him both all this and all the substance of all the Arguments which he brings to prove it. For none of the Protestant Churches have denyed, but maintain,

1 That all the offices of Christ are needfull and cooperating to, and in the worke of Mediatourship; that Christ not only as our high Priest, but also as our King and Prophet made satisfaction for us, and makes his satisfaction effectuall to us.

2 That the object of justifying faith is Christ in all his offices King, Priest, and Prophet.

3. That these offices of Christ are not to be severed by us, because counited and coworking in him. He layes not down, nor puts from him any one of his offices when he either justifyeth, sanctifieth or illuminateth, &c. but doth all and every of them, as Lord, Saviour and Teacher.

Yet when all this is granted to him, his cause is never the stronger, nor ours at all the weaker. Nay he declares himself guilty of the fault wherewith he chargeth the innocent, *viz.* of separating Christs offices, holding him forth to us as redeeming us only as our high Priest, governing and giving Lawes to his Church only by his Kingly office, enlightening us in the truth only as our Prophet: when contrariwise we teach that *Jesus Christ, i. e.* the *Anointed* of God, in all his offices, and anointings, is made unto us of God wisdome, righteousnesse, sanctification and redemption; not wisdome in one only of his offices, righteousnesse in another, &c. but all in all, as the Scripture witnesseth, 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. Nevertheless we deny not but these acts and benefits of Christ are to be attributed more properly and peculiarly to one then another office of Christ, yet so that the cooperation of the other offices therein is not wholly to be denyed,

But

But this we deny, that there is *any other fountain opened for the washing away of our sins but the bloud of Christ only*; or *any other satisfaction made to the justice of God but by the sacrifice of Christ alone*; yet so as this bloud and sacrifice as they are primarily our high Priests so are they our Kings and Prophets also, howbeit the bloud and sacrifice of one Christ alone. And herein we follow the Scriptures leading threed which affirm not only the Priest to have dyed for us, but our Prophet or Shepheard also: *I am the good Shepheard, and give and lay down my life for the sheep*, Joh. 10 11, 15. *He came not to be ministred unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransome for many*, Mat. 20. 28. *viz.* to seal the doctrine with his bloud which he had taught with his lips, and to make the way through *the veil of his flesh, thorough his bloud*, which he had taught to be the only way into the *Holiest to the Father*. And as the Shepheard so the Lord and King also; It was the *LORD, that was betrayed*, 1 Cor. 11. 23. *crucified*, 1 Cor. 2. 8. *killed*, Act. 3. 15. *and raised again*, 1 Cor. 6. 14. *Even the Lord of glory and Prince of life*. Therefore it is that the holy Ghost cals it *the Lords death*, 1 Cor. 11. 26. *The Lords body, and the Lords bloud*, 1 Cor. 11. 27, 29. And needfull was it that Christ as Lord and King with all his power should thus grapple with sin, death and hell, on our behalfe: how else should he have vanquished them, and *having spoyled the Principalities and powers, made a shew of them openly, and triumphed over them*? Col. 2. 15. And without this victory his death had been to us vain, our enemies had remained unconquered, and our selves unransomed. *The strong man had not been driven out by a stronger then he*, Luk. 11. 21, 22. Thus we neither divide nor separate the offices of Christ one from another, but conjoyn them all in the death and passion of Christ, by which alone we believe and teach that the Lord, Priest and Prophet, Christ Jesus hath made satisfaction for our sins.

But we uttterly deny that which Mr. *Baxter* drives at, that Christ as our Lord, that is, as a Lawgiver, and [to speak in Mr. *Baxters* words, *Thes.* 31.] *as he doth establish the morall Law commanding perfect obedience, and forbidding every sin, as exactly as ever the Covenant of works*; is the object of justifying faith, as justifying. This was that great and principall article which *Luther* with much vehemency defended against the Papists, *viz.* that Christ no *Moses, no Exactor, no giver of Lawes* [in reference to justification] *but a giver of grace, a Saviour*, &c. pronouncing it an accursed [doc-

Luth. in Gal. Cap. 2. 20. & alibi.

doc-

Popish doctrine which the *Papists taught, that he justifyeth as a Lawgiver, that they which so paint him out, make him not a Christ but a Fiend or Devill.*

The state of the question then is betwixt him and us, not whether Christ as Lord as well as Saviour; but whether by the sacrifice of himself for us, or else by giving Laws and Commanding all duties of obedience to us also; be the object of justifying faith, as justifying, *i. e.* whether our faith by obeying Christ in the works of righteousnesse as well as by cleaving to Christ crucifyed do justifie? We maintain that the death of Christ, or Christ dying for us, is alone offered to our faith for justification: he contrariwise, that Christ as commanding the duties of obedience is the object of faith as justifying.

Our Assertion that Christ suffering for us is the alone object of justifying faith, as such; may be confirmed by many Arguments.

One Argument may be drawn from the offerings and sacrifices of the old Testament, and the sacraments both of the old and new Testament. Such as these have exhibited, or do still exhibit Christ to us for redemption or justification, such is our faith still to receive him. But these all have exhibited and do exhibit Christ, not as a Law-giver, but as an offering or sacrifice for our sins: therefore under this notion our faith is to receive him to justification. So all the sacrifices, circumcision, paschal Lamb, &c. under the old Testament, directed the faith of men to Christs sacrifice to the bloud and wounds of Christ for purging, &c. Or if any will say (as he may truly say) that circumcision typified also the renovation of the heart by the Spirit of Christ, himself may answer himself, that this was to sanctification, and not to justification.

2 The whole stream of the Gospell leads our faith to Christ crucifyed or dying for justification. *As the serpent was lifted up in the wildernesse, so shall the Son of man be lifted up,* [*viz.* upon the crosse] *that whosoever beleeveth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life,* John 3. 14,15. *I determined to know* (*i. e.* to preach among you for your knowledg) *nothing else but Christ, and him crucifyed,* 1 Cor. 2. 2. *If I be lifted up I will draw all men to me,* (signifying what death he should die.) Joh. 12. 32, 33. *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my bloud,* &c. Joh. 6. 47,—58. *Whom God hath set forth*

as a propitiation through faith in his bloud, Rom. 4. 25. *Being justified by his bloud, Rom.* 5. 9. *The bloud of Christ cleanseth from all sin, 1 Joh.* 1. 7. *The Lambe of God* [sacrificed] *that taketh away the sins of the World, Joh.* 1. 29. *Having made peace through the bloud of his Crosse. Col.* 1. 20. *And reconciled us in the body of his flesh through death. Ver.* 21, 22. *Having redemption through his bloud even the forgivenesse of sin, Col* 1. 14. *He hath purchased his Church with his bloud, Act.* 20. 28. *Having boldnesse to enter into the Holiest by the bloud of Jesus, by the new and living way, which he hath consecrated through the veil of his flesh. Heb.* 10. 19, 20. *He was wounded for our sins and bruised for our iniquities, and by his stripes we are healed, Isa.* 53. 5. *God forbid that I should glory in any thing but in the Crosse of our Lord Jesus Christ, Gal.* 6. 14. I might even weary the Reader with allegations of Scriptures every way as pertinently and properly making Christ dying for us the object of faith as justifying. And I challenge Mr. *Baxter* and all his admirers, to produce one Scripture proving Christ as a Law-giver to be the object of our faith to justification. If they cannot do it, let it be acknowledged as an audacious and daring presumption in Mr. *Baxter*, from his own authority, without and against the Word, to lay it down here as a position and principle of Religion.

3 If the death and sufferings alone of Christ (and not his giving of Lawes and commanding duties of righteousnesse) be the sole and entire satisfaction which he hath given to the justice of God for us, then Christ in his death, and not at all in his Laws and Commands of such duties, is to be made the object of our faith for justification. But the former is true: therefore the latter also.

Both the consequent and consequence of the Proposition must needs be granted by all Protestants (though not by Remonstrants and Socinians) which hold the imputation of the obedience of Christ to us by which he hath satisfyed Gods justice; that he for us and we in and by him have done our law: that his satisfying obedience is by imputation so fully made ours to justification as if we had done it our selves; which is the doctrine of all Protestant Churches. But Mr. *Baxter* hateth this phrase of imputation of Christs obedience, will not, cannot admit it; for then he destroyes and pronounceth all at the best to be erroneous whatsoever he hath spowted out for sacred doctrine; he grants the imputation of nothing else but our own faith and works to justification; so

that

that after his principles the consequence is not so clear. Let us see therefore whether also after and upon his own grounds, it may stand firm and undenyable.

1 Then, Mr. *Baxter Thes.* 18. affirmes our Legall righteousnesse (as he cals it) *i. e.* that righteousnesse by which the Law is satisfyed for our breaches of it, to be in Christ; and in calling this Legall righteousnesse *ours*, and the satisfaction therein made *ours*, he doth imply that the satisfaction of Christ is the thing that being made *ours* is that which justifyeth us. This he speaks out yet more plainly, *pa.* 218. telling us that Christs satisfaction must be made *ours*, else we cannot be justifyed: that so far as by imputation no more is understood then the bestowing of Christs satisfaction on us, so that we shall have the justice and benefits thereof as truely as if we had satisfyed our selves; in this sense he granteth the imputation of Christs satisfactory righteousnesse; and thus according to his principles, that act, or those acts of Christ by which he made satisfaction for us, or rather Christ in these acts is to be made the object of our faith as justifying. According to this rule *pa.* 54. he makes the Active righteousnesse of Christ (considered as such) part of the satisfaction together with the Passive: and to lay a ground for that which he here inferreth, *pa.* 57, he affirms that among other parts of Christs righteousnesse or Active obedience, *his assuming of the humane nature, his establishing and sealing the Covenant, his working miracles, his sending his Disciples to convert and save the world, his overcoming death and rising again, &c.* (which were all works most proper to his kingly office) to have been meritorious and satisfactory. And all this to lay a foundation for what here and *Thes* 72. he buildeth, *viz.* Christ as a Law-giver as well as a Redeemer is the object of justifying faith as such, and that obedience to his Laws as well as faith in his sufferings, hath to do in our justification.

We finde then Mr. *Baxter* making Christ in his Legislative righteousnesse upon this ground alone to be the object of justifying faith, as therein he in part satisfyed for our disobedience. Therefore *hoc nomine* and in this respect must the consequence of the proposition stand firm with him, *viz.* If only the death and sufferings of Christ and not at all his Legislative righteousnesse, be the sole and entire satisfaction, *&c.* then Christ in his death onely and not, *&c.* is to be made the object of faith as justi-

fying. For in that righteousneſſe alone by which Chriſt ſatisfyed, is faith to apprehend him to juſtification, by his own rules.

The Aſſumption then remianes alone needfull to be proved, *viz.* that Chriſts death and ſuffering alone is the entire ſatisfaction. This is clear to them which will not wilfully retain beams in their eyes, from theſe Scriptures which affirm the *life of Chriſt ſacrificed for us to be the Ranſom, Mat.* 20. 28. 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. *The Price by which we are purchaſed and redeemed from thraldome.* 1 *Cor.* 6. 20. & 7. 23. *The propitiation for our ſins through faith in his bloud. Rom.* 3. 25. 1 *Joh.* 4. 10. *i. e.* that one and only act of Chriſt by which our ſinnes are expiated, the juſtice of God ſatisfyed, and his wrath appeaſed, ſo that we finde him now a God propitious and gratious to us.

But if we will hear the Scriptures ſpeaking at large and articulately confirming this poſition, that the ſatisfaction made by Chriſt is begun, continued and perfected meerly and wholly in and by Chriſts ſufferings, in ſteed of many Teſtimonies which the Scripture affordeth, I ſhall pitch upon two diſputes only of the Apoſtle in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. The former in *cap.* 9. beginning at the 11 and 12 *verſes*. That *Chriſt being become an high Prieſt*, &c. *by his own bloud entred once into the Holy place, having obtained for us eternall Redemption.* I need not explain the words for the edification of any that hath but read the Scriptures, and taken but overly into his conſideration, how that which was yearly under the Law figured in the act of the high Prieſt the type, was at length effectually accompliſhed by Chriſt the Anti-type. Again, *ver.* 13, 14. *If the bloud of Buls*, &c. *ſanctifyed to the purifying of the Fleſh, how much more ſhall the bloud of Chriſt, which by the eternall Spirit offered himſelfe to God, without ſpot, purge your conſcience from dead works?* &c. An undeniable vertue and efficacy in the bloud of Chriſt alone, without any further acts of Chriſt himſelf to purge the conſcience, *e. i.* to abſolve and juſtifie, is here affirmed. And further *ver.* 15. *He is the Mediatour of the new Covenant, that by means of death, for the redemption of the tranſgreſſions under the firſt Teſtament, they which are called may receive the promiſe of the eternall inheritance, i. e.* the eternall inheritance promiſed, by means of Chriſts death, and not by his Legiſlative righteouſneſſe. And *ver.* 26. *Chriſt now once at the end of the world hath appeared to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf.* What ſin? All ſin according

to that of *John*, *The bloud of Christ purgeth from all sin*, 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. And if from all sin, what sin is there left for Christs giving of Lawes to put away? or what of justification left out for it to perfect? or of full satisfaction not made, for it, to compleat? Lastly, *ver.* 28. *Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.* How did he bear them, but as the Apostle saith, *He hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us? Gal.* 3. 13. and in bearing them on our behalfe he satisfyed justice on our behalf. And this is affirmed to be by offering himself for us, not by giving Laws to us, or injoyning duties upon us.

His second dispute is *chap.* 10. where the Apostle having mentioned the feebleness of the sacrifices offered by the Law, to take away sin, brings in Christ offering himself to accomplish what these could not, and declaring his ready obedience to *fulfill that will of God written in the volume of Gods book to offer himself a sacrifice for sin*, with a *Lo, I come*: *by this will of God* (saith he) *we are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all, ver.* 5, ——10. he saith not, we have our consecration to be holy, by the commands of Christ, *&c.* but by the offering of his body. And that by sanctification is to be here understood purification and justification; I think it will not be denyed: However *ver.* 12. it is added, that *he having once offered sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down at the right hand of God*, his sitting down and resting argues his work the work of our redemption and justification perfected in every degree and number. His rest is as Gods rest was from the beginning, then the work of Creation, now of Redemption being made absolutely perfect, the rest followed; and where had this work its beginning, progresse and perfection? In his once offering of sacrifice for sins for ever. Nothing here of Christs Law-giving and rule from the bottom to the top of the work of Redemption or justification. The sacrifice alone satisfyed, so far all things of men are here excluded, as that nothing else of Christ is required. As it is more fully yet expressed *ver.* 14. For *by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.* His perfecting Mr. *Baxter* will not deny to be his making of perfect satisfaction for them, and this is done by one offering of Christ. Will Mr. *Baxter* be so audacious as to oppose the holy Ghost with his Nay, telling that there must be somewhat else besides this offering, *viz.* Christs Law-giving as part of the satisfaction made for us. Lastly,

to put all out of doubt, and besides the bounds of cavilling, what the Apostle should mean here by sanctifying and perfecting, this also is unfolded in plain words, *ver.* 17, 18. *viz. The taking away of their sinnes and iniquities: And where the remission of these is, there is no more offering*, &c. satisfaction is made to the full and no need of any addition for the perfecting thereof.

I acknowledg there are many things required to condition Christ that he might be an effectuall offerer and offering, else could not the redemption and justification which are by him have been completed; or the satisfaction made for us been perfect. Yet that after the work of satisfaction, as formerly of Creation finished, and a totall resting from any further addition to it, yet the Father worketh and the Son worketh hitherto in the business of governing and preserving of what is so created and repayred; yet this doth not at all hinder but that full satisfaction is made by the alone offering of Christ.

And here once more I call upon Mr. *Baxter* and all his adherents to bring forth any one testimony of Scripture, to prove that either Christs Law-giving or any other act of Christ besides this one of offering himself a sacrifice for sin, is by the Scripture in whole or in part affirmed satisfactory to God for our justification. Let them not as Mr. *Baxter* before doth from *pa.* 54. to *pa.* 61. bring their peradventures, and may-bees, and possibles, and verisimilies, (for are the conjectures and results of a working and self-conceited brain, to be laid as a foundation whereon to build an Article of our faith?) But let them bring the oracle of the Word testifying either that Christ hath done, or God hath required of him or accepted from him such and such works in part of satisfaction. Else our ears will be deaf to hear mans prattle, being attentive in such matters only to the voice of the holy Ghost.

This shall suffice for the opening and confirming of our Tenet, untill it shall be further opposed. Now let us hear what Mr. *Baxter* hath to say against us, or for the proof of his Assumption.

B. *Pa.* 255. *That Christ as a Saviour only, or in respect of his Priestly office only, is not the object of justifying faith; But that faith doth as really and immediately receive him as King, and in so doing justifies this I prove thus,*

If he mean otherwiſe then I have before declared to be the judgment of Proteſtants, and (as he terms them) godly and learned Divines, of ſingular eſteem in the Church of God, p. 53. and one of them to be of more authority then many writers and readers, *Appen. pa.* 12. he feigneth an Adverſary, and beats the winde. But againſt our Aſſertion as I have explained it; or for his Aſſertion ſetting up the commands of duty by Chriſt together with the ſacrifice of Chriſts death, to be the object of faith as juſtifying, if he ſay any thing we are to examine it. As for the reſt which he ſpeaks beſides the purpoſe, we ſhall look on it and neglect it.

B. 1. *The Goſpell doth not reveal Chriſts offices as ſeparated: but as they are revealed, ſo they muſt be beleeved.*

This makes not againſt us, but againſt himſelf. We make Chriſt in his offering himſelf for us our *Melchiſedek*, King, Prieſt and Prophet; he divides in reſtraining the Kingly office only to giving of Lawes, &c. and not at all acting mediatorily in his death.

B. 2. *Neither doth it offer Chriſt in his Priſtly office only as ſeparated from his Kingly: though it may ſometimes preſſe the acceptance of him in one reſpect; and ſometimes in another: but as he is offered, ſo he muſt be received.*

We grant him all, but what hence will reſult to his cauſe?

B. 3. *Scripture no where tyeth juſtification to the receipt of him as our Prieſt only; therefore we muſt not do ſo.*

Scripture every where affirmeth Gods juſtice to be ſatisfyed by the blood of Chriſt, and ſends our faith to that fountain alone for purging; therefore we muſt do ſo.

B. 4. *How commonly doth Scripture joyn his offices together, calling him our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt?*

Hath Mr. *Baxter* in a dream met with any bug-bear that doth otherwiſe?

B. 5. *If we receive him not as King, we receive him not as entire Saviour; for he ſaveth us, not only by dying for us, but alſo by reducing us really into communion with God, and guiding us by his Lawes, and protecting and perfecting us by his government, and ſubduing our enemies.*

The husband is in ſome ſenſe ſaid ſometimes to ſave the wife, and the wife to ſave the husband; and the Miniſters to ſave themſelves and

others

others, 1 *Cor.* 7. 16. 1 *Tim.* 4. 16. Must therefore the husband or wife, or Minister be made the object of saving or justifying faith as such?

2 The question is not here how many acts of Christ, of men of our selves, are instrumentall to our salvation, but what act of Christ hath satisfyed for our sinnes, by the application whereof we are constituted actually righteous, are pardoned and justified before God? This we maintain to be Christ offering himselfe to God for us, and let Mr. *Baxter* disapprove it.

3 We deny not that Christ hath other operations by which to perfect and sustain the justifyed to eternall life; yea to prevent our faith, infusing it, and directing it to himself crucifyed, and satisfying for us; and to follow it by supporting it and holding us fixed by faith to himself thus satisfying for us, and to stabish his Kingdome within us in peace righteousnesse and joy in the holy Ghost; yea that in these Christ must be made the object of our faith for our confirmation, dependence and comfort: But as justifying and fetching from him the matter of justification, or rather the righteousnesse by which we are justifyed, it must know nothing else but Christ and him crucifyed; as before hath been proved, and we wait to hear from Mr. *Baxter* or any of his disciples, one Scripture to confute it.

B. 6. *His Kingly office is a true part of his entire office of Mediatourship. Now the sincerity of acts in Morall respects lyeth in their true suitablenesse to the nature of their objects: As God is not truly loved except he be loved entirely; so neither is Christ truely received, except you receive him entirely. It is a lame, partiall faith, and no true faith that taketh Christ only in the notion of a deliverer from guilt and punishment without any accepting of him as our Lord and Governour though I beleeve that the hope of being pardoned and saved is the first thing that moveth men to receive Christ, yet doe they being moved, receive him as their Lord also, or else they do not receive him sincerely.*

Sound without substance, no more to his purpose then if he had said nothing. What one Protestant ever held it a sincere faith that apprehends Christ to justification, and not for illumination, and sanctification also? will it then follow that illumination and sanctification are justification? or that faith as the

myes acting doth justifie? Then also my hand in feeding clothes me, and in clothing feeds me.

B. 7. *The exalting of his Kingly office is as principall an end of his dying and becoming Mediator, as is the saving of us, and exalting of his Priestly office; see the 2. Psalme, & Rom. 14. 9. To this end he both dyed, rose again, and revived that he might be the Lord both of the dead and the living; and therefore the receiving of him as Priest alone, is not like to be the condition of our justification.*

An invincible argument! he that will not be swayed by it, let him continue in his wits still. As if whatsoever thing God had an end to exalt by Christs death must be the object of faith as justifying. God intended by it to exalt his elect; are the elect therefore the object of justifying faith? Besides we say not that the receiving of Christ as Priest alone justifyeth.

B. *So that if Christ put both into the condition, we must not separate what he hath joyned.*

Himself (as I have shewed) separateth: we joyn them together in Christs passion, and in the rest of his acts and benefits.

B. *But the main ground of their errour who think otherwise, is this, They think acceptance of the mercy offered, doth make it ours immediately in a naturall way, as the accepting of a thing from men, and so as if he that accepteth pardon should have it, and he that accepteth sanctity should have it, &c. But Christ (as I have shewed) establisheth his office and authority, before he bestoweth his mercies, and though accepting be the proper condition, yet doth it not confer the title to us as it is an accepting primarily, but as it is the Covenants condition: If we we should take possession when we have no title in Law, God would quickly challenge us for our bold usurpation, and deal with us as with him that intruded without the wedding garment. There is more adoe then come in, and sit down, and take what we have a minde to: God hath put all his Sons offices into the condition, to be received and submitted to: Either all or none must be accepted. And if all be in the condition, then the receiving of all must needs justifie upon the grounds that I have laid down before.*

It is not a new thing to see heresie usurping the chaire to condemne truth of errour. The reasoning here is wholly carnall and naturall, besides the rule of the Gospell. When he calls faith a *naturall way* of receiving the mercy offered by Christ, and our own worth and works (implyedly) the *spirituall way*,

how doth he put light for darkneſſe, and darkneſſe for light, giving to the truely ſpirituall, cauſe of renewing that of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. *The naturall man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God*, &c. Can Heaven and Hell be more oppoſite either to other then the Apoſtles doctrine to Mr. *Baxters*? The Apoſtle calls the *way of faith alone, the Spirit*, and the way of works ſuperadded to faith for juſtification, *the fleſh*, *Gal.* 3. 3. Is it Fleſh or Spirit in Mr. *Baxter* that makes him a contradictor of the holy Ghoſt ſpeaking by the Apoſtle. The way of faith is the way of grace, ſupernaturall, *Fleſh and bloud cannot reveal it unto us, but our Father which is in heaven.* But the way of works is beneath grace, dictated by nature it ſelf, therefore naturall, but ſo that all the force of nature cannot effectuallize it to juſtification.

It is a ſlander that he puts upon the Orthodox whom he hateth, therefore repreſents them as Noddies, and Simpletons, pretending that they teach faith to be nothing but an accepting of pardon, and accepting of holineſſe, [*&c.*] Nay we make neither pardon, nor holineſſe, nor the [*&c.*] but Chriſt Jeſus the object of our faith, adhere and cleave to him for all, [yet not confounding his benefits, or the means by which he applyeth them, but wait by faith at the ſeverall ſluces by which he conferreth his ſeverall benefits, to receive the waſhing away of our guilt by the effuſion of his bloud, and holineſſe or ſanctification by the effuſion of his Spirit: and not contrariwiſe holineſſe by his bloud, and pardon by the effuſion of his Spirit. So we repair by faith to Chriſt for all, becauſe in him as in the ſpring is all; yet ſo as that in coming to him alone that hath all, we come to the Sun of righteouſneſſe for light, to the fountain for life, and to the Spirit of ſanctification which flowes from him for holyneſſe. He cryes againſt ſeparation, and makes it (as I have ſhewed) for union, and makes confuſions. Where doth he mention any office or operation of faith to ſanctification? or uſe of ſanctification but to juſtification? or what is faith with him but a compound of all endowments, works, and duties? And thus he confounds faith and works, Chriſts righteouſneſſe, and mans righteouſneſſe, morall honeſty, and Goſpell ſanctification, of all together making up one linſy-woolſy juſtification or righteouſneſs to juſtification, which the Spirit of God never revealed, but the ſpirit of Mr. *Baxter* hath hatched.

What

What he speaketh of Christ stablishing his office, either is above my understanding, or else is not at all to his purpose. And what of accepting as under the notion of accepting, or as under the notion of a condition, hath been enough spoken to in what was before said about the instrumentality of faith.

All that followeth is wholly averse from, and adverse to the doctrine of the Gospell, Jewish and Popish. For what meanes he by our title in Law, and the wedding garment, but the whole furniture of works and duties done in obedience to a supposed legislative authority of Christ? Without these and before these to take possession, *i. e.* to dare to adhere to Christ for justification is usurpation, and an incurring of Gods vengeance for usurping: Thus beating off from Christ sinners, chief sinners for whom Christ hath dyed. How doth the spirit of the rejected Jewes work upon this man? when they heard of righteousnesse and salvation offered to the Gentiles, a common and profane people that were not holy, how did they stretch their throats, and rend their clothes in a zeal against this indignity? So this man hearing of the justificition of Publicans and sinners, *hath his eye evill because God is good*: tears himself with anger, crying, usurpation, vengeance, hell-fire; why? because they had not put on the *filthy rags of mans righteousnesse*, which he cals the *wedding garment*, and thereby gotten title to Christ before they were so bold as to beleeve in him, and girded on their own gaol-clothes first, and then have put on Christ upon them, that their own righteousnesse might have been neereſt the heart, and Christs righteousnesse at a further distance, as having no efficacy but from our own righteousnesse effectuallizing it. Unto all this I shall use only that oracle of the Lord Christ, *The Publicans and harlots enter into the Kingdome of God before these Pharisaicall justiciaries, and whited sepulchers.* Let Christ alone be my wedding garment, I leave all that unrighteous righteousnesse which Mr. *Baxter* would wrest out from the Kingly office, entire to Mr. *Baxter* to compleat his righteousnesse to justification. I know no other title to the justification of the new Covenant, which the chief sinners must look after before they possesse it, but the grant of grace in the new Covenant, and their closure by faith with Christ, in whom God presents himself to justifie and reconcile them to himself. One voice of my Bride-groom, crying, *Whosoever thirsteth*, *i.e.* is dry and empty of all good in himself, *let him come to me*, Act. 22. 21, 22, 23.

and whosoever will, let him drink of the well of the water of life freely, *Rev.* 22. 17. is of more force with me then ten thousand contradicting voices such as this of Mr. *Baxter*, *There is more adoe then come in, and sit down, and take what we have a mind to*: If this man had the imaginary place of *Peter* to be Porter of heaven, how quickly would he forfeit his place by repelling those whom alone Christ will have admitted, and admitting those that Christ will have repelled? Christ admits beleevers, not doers, this man rejects all beleevers that are not doers before they are beleevers.

The rest that he saith here is sacrificed to his Goddesse the Lady Condition. A deity that the Scriptures never knew; nor yet all the whole University of Athens. They erected an *Altar* indeed to the *unknown God*, *Act.* 17. 23. see the depth of Mr. *Baxter*, he hath found the *Antipodas* which the old Mathematicians wrote of but could never find: the deity which the learned Athenians worshiped, but worshiped they knew not what. This *Goddesse Condition* by some help of the Socinians and Arminians hath M. *Baxter* brought to light, and invested her with more glittering ornaments then they had wit to do; only he hath not yet built a Temple and there enthroned her, for all men to fall down with him and worship her. Yet of this Almighty power he proclaimes her that she binds the hands of God and Men: the one cannot give the other cannot receive without her mediation. Neither the eternall Father, nor the eternall Son can shew the least mercy to a poor sinner, nor the sinner partake of one crumb of mercy from the Father by the Son, unlesse this great Lady Condition say Amen to it; so high and so to vast a bignesse hath the Man already stretched her. Yet is he still adding, and in this place he is nayling in the offices of Christ into her bulk. But because this *Colossus* is only from his own brain, and nothing of Gods Word brought to own one piece of it, let us leave him admiring it not adoring his fabrick or figment, and refer our selves to answer when he brings any thing from Gods Word.

We have seen by this time the invalidity of the Assumption of Mr. *Baxters* Argument, and of all the Reasons which he brings to prove it; either to give proppage to his own assertion, or any way to shake and weaken ours.

I am to examin also the consequent and consequence of his Proposition. And here I deny both that other works and duties are required with faith to justification, and all consequency hereof from this supposition that Christ in all his offices is the object of faith as justifying. This Mr. *Baxter* layeth down first in and under his 72. *Thesis*, *pag.* 266. *& deinceps.* His *Thesis* runs thus,

B. *As the accepting of Christ for Lord, (which is the hearts subjection) is as essentiall a part of justifying faith, as the accepting of him for our Saviour: So consequently sincere obedience (which is the effect of the former) hath as much to do in justifying us before God, as affiance (which is the fruit of the latter.)*

The Antecedent of this Position is nothing else but the reassuming of his former Assumption with a short explication and short obscuration added to it. His obscuration in this, that he names justifying without the adjection there used [as such] we will understand him here meaning what there he speaks, else we run from the question. His explication, that here he unfolds what he meant there by accepting Christ for Lord, *viz.* the hearts subjection, [to Christs Legislative power, or his commanding of woeks and obedience.] In this sense we deny still that the accepting of Christ for Lord is an essentiall part of justifying faith, as such. And all that which he seems further to bring for the confirmation thereof, *pa.* 287, & 288. is but the saying over again of what he had said before, and a little prattle of Physicall and morall Philosophy, which is as fit to explain to us the mystery of Christ, faith and justification; as a net is to hold fast the winde: and yet if all his reasoning thence were granted, his cause is as naked and weak with it as without it. The rest is nothing but words, his own words, his bare affirmations, wherewith we have been so much wearied, that the very thought of them is offensive. We expect Gods word, let him bring it, or hold his peace.

The consequent of this *Thesis*, which is also the consequent of the proposition of the Argument which we are here examining; he puts here more fraudulently then I rendered it there, *viz.* that sincere Obedience doth as much justifie as affiance, that, as the fruit of our accepting Christ for Lord and Law-giver, as much

as this, which is a fruit of accepting Chriſt for our Saviour. How ſlippery is falſhood, and how full of evaſions? Let him ſpeak poſitively and plainly, hath ſuch obedience any thing to do in juſtifying us? I ſhould not lie if I ſhould ſay, I have conquered ſo many Armies, taken ſo many Towns in, and brought ſo much gold from the Weſt-Indies, as Mr. *Baxter*: yet though I ſpeak no lie, I cannot be excuſed from ſpeaking vanity in ſaying it; for neither of us have done it. But let us ſee whether there be more poſitiveneſſe in his proofs then in his affirmations. In his 288. *pag.* thus he ſpeaketh to it.

B. *That obedience is as neer a fruit of faith as affiance, is evident; if you take it for the obedience of the ſoul, in acts that are no more remote from the heart then affiance is: and ſo is the obedience of our actions externall, in its formall reſpect (as obedience): though not in its materiall, becauſe the imperate acts are not all ſo neer the fountain as the elicite.*

If by this profound reaſoning there be any that will not be perſuaded to be a Chriſtian of Mr. *Baxters* painting, let him continue to be not only almoſt but altogether a Chriſtian of Chriſts making, and he ſhall never ſuſtain damage thereby to his conſcience or ſalvation. The queſtion is not here how neer or how remote a fruit of faith, obedience is, but whether the neereſt or moſt diſtant fruits thereof, conſidered (as Mr. *Baxter* doth) as our acts or deeds; nor yet whether theſe acts as cloſe to, and remote from the heart, nor whether imperate or elicit acts, but whether ſuch acts are at all appointed of God to juſtification? We deny it, and Mr. *Baxter* brings nothing to prove it.

Yet not to ſuffer the leſſe exerciſed and informed Reader to depart unſatisfyed, nor to roll up in darkneſſe and ſilence any truth of the Goſpell, proper here to be cleared; I ſhall manifeſt in what reſpect Mr. *Baxters* aſſertion may be here warily granted. Chriſt as Saviour, and ſatisfier, *i. e.* by the ſacrifice of his death, hath made a way for ſinners to God, yea made himſelf the way, and is in reſpect thereof made to us of God, righteouſneſſe. This he did principally (not only) as our high Prieſt, the other offices were not excluded. This was not the whole work that he was ſent to do. He muſt bring into the way alſo the he hath made, all that are to be ſaved in it and by it, *Joh.* 10.16. And having brought them he muſt alſo enable them to bring

forth

forth fruit to God by being their sanctifier, *Joh.* 15. 5. *Rom.* 7. 4. 6. in these works he acteth principally as our Prophet and King. To bring us into communion with him, and into that way which he hath made through himself to righteousnesse and blessednesse, as our Prophet he teacheth, and as our King commandeth, but as Priest, Prophet and King effectuallizeth his teaching and commands by his Spirit: In this respect his commands to us of coming by faith into union with him, of adhering to him, and reposing our selves wholly upon him for righteousnesse and life, we grant that Christ as our King commanding, as far as we look to the thing commanded, *viz.* faith in his bloud alone for justification, is an eminent instrument of our justification; and as he effectuallizeth the merits of his death to us may not be unproperly made the object of our faith as justifying. But in his other forementioned operations upon us by his Word and Spirit, not only to teach and command, but also by his infinite power to enliven us to bring forth fruits of so great a salvation, and to walke worthy of it in all holinesse and righteousnesse, and exactnesse to fulfill all duties and works of Christian obedience; In this he is to be made indeed the object of justifying faith, or (which is the same) of sanctifying faith, yet not as it justifyeth, but as it sanctifyeth. We should not a little maim both the office of faith, and the benefits which we have by Christ, if we should restrain them all to justification. Nay Christ is made unto us as well sanctification as righteousnesse; and faith adhereth as fast to Christ for the one as the other: else it is not a legitimate but bastard faith. Nevertheless Christ is not in the same respect the object of faith as sanctifying, and of the same as justifying.

Because this is Mr. *Baxters* supereminent Argument, in which himself seems most to trust, and by which so many learned Ministers do even professe themselves staggered and astonished: I shall omit nothing unexamined that he speaketh in the affirming or confirming of it, lest any should take occasion to say that the strongest part thereof is not, because it could not be, answered. Therefore have I left out nothing of what he hath said to the other Proposition; though many things were unworthy of Animadversion. To the consequent of this Proposition, he speaketh more in his next two *Theses*, *viz.* 73. & 74. what is inserted in these

these two Aphorisms, more fit to be examined under another notion; I shall here forbear to transcribe, leaving it for its proper place. What is to the present purpose, he thus expresseth,

B. Thes. 73. pa. 289. *Faith only doth not justifie, in opposition to the works of the Gospell, but those works do also justifie.*

Thes. 74. *Both faith and works justifie in the same kind of causality,* viz. *as* Causæ sine quibus non, *or mediate and improper causes;* or (*as Dr.* Twisse) causæ dispositivæ, *&c. The like may be said of Love, and of others in the same station.*

These are but meer affirmations, and contain no reasons to confirme, only in the latter *Thesis*, seemingly at least, is produced the authority of that Antinomian Dr. *Twisse:* but with so fine a conveyance as that he may be kept in or left out at pleasure if Mr. *Baxter* be dealt with to make good his allegation of him. He knowes the name and authority of Dr. *Twisse* to be great and amiable, as an eminent servant of Christ, and patron of his truth. He concludes therefore that his assertions will be swallowed with the more facility having such an authority to sweeten and fortifie them. Therefore so interserteth his Testimony, that his Reader may suppose Dr. *Twisse* to affirm works to be *causas dispositivas* of justification. I neither have read all that Dr. *Twisse* hath written, neither do I so far trust my memory, as to deny it flatly and peremptorily. Yet by knowing Dr. *Twisse* aright, I am as confident that *Bellarmine* hath taught the righteousnesse of justification to be meerly by imputation, and our justification only by faith, as that Dr. *Twisse* hath any way affirmed works in this or any other respect to prevent or operate to our justification. If he did, why doth not Mr. *Baxter* quote the place, as elsewhere he doth very diligently when the Testimony of the Author makes for him? or why in the end of his Appendix where he sucks out of Dr. *Twisse* and others, all that he thinks may make for his advantage, doth he not cite this so pregnant Testimony? But he hath left to himself an evasion, that when he hath beguiled whom he can with such an authority, being found at last, he can answer his meaning is, the term or phrase, (viz. *causa dispositiva*) upon some other, not to this Argument, is that which Dr. *Twisse* useth. I finde him indeed calling works *causæ sine quibus non*; or *dispositivas salutis*, of our salvation or glorification, never of our justification: And so far is he from attributing

buting under this term what Mr. *Baxter* attributeth, that he seriously abandoneth it. So he expresseth himself, *Vind. Lib. 1. Par. 2. Sect. 2. Proxime finem. Vis majus peccatum est quam justificationem quærere ex operibus*; and almost in the next words, *Nullum opus Deo gratius & acceptius est, quam sibi & justitiæ suæ in negotio salutis renunciare, et in Christo unice confidere.* But come we now to that which he speaks for confirmation, the first part consists in prefacing. His own conscience telling him that it is a Pharisaicall, Popish principle which he hear positeth, he forelayes his Proeme to the proofe thereof thus;

B. *I know this is the doctrine that will have the loudest out-cries raised against it: and will make some cry out, Heresie, Popery, Socinianism, and what not? For mine own part the searcher of hearts knoweth, that not singularity, affection of novelty, nor any goodwill to Popery, provoketh me to entertain it; but that I have earnestly sought the Lords direction upon my knees, before I durst adventure on it, and that I resisted the light of this conclusion as long as I was able; but a man cannot force his own understanding, if the evidence of truth force it not, though he may force his pen or tongue to silence or dissembling. That which I shall do further is to give you some proofs*, &c.

First, here a word to such Ministers as being more the disciples of men then of Christ, and better versed in Sophistry then Divinity, do only not deify Mr. *Baxter*, maintaining all his doctrine in this book to be the doctrine of all the Protestant Churches. Why do they anger the man in charging him with so low a spirit, that he hath nothing but what is common with him and the most eminent lights in the Church? will not he be offended with it? doth he not here in some kind pronounce himself a dissenter? and that what he here asserteth is that which the Protestant Churches detest as heresie? doth not himself even before experience what acceptance his book would have, as it were proclaime himself in this point departed from us into the Tents of Papists and Socinians?

As to Mr. *Baxter*, 1. We have before granted to him that he gives no cause of suspicion that affection of singularity and novelty hath drawn him into this opinion. For he is not herein singular, nor is his doctrine new, but such as the Phari ees in Christs time, and the false Apostles in the Apostles times, and the worst of Hereticks from thence unto our dayes have unanimously profes-

these two Aphorisms, more fit to be examined under another notion; I shall here forbear to transcribe, leaving it for its proper place. What is to the present purpose, he thus expresseth,

B. Thes. 73. pa. 289. *Faith only doth not justifie, in opposition to the works of the Gospell, but those works do also justifie.*

Thes. 74. *Both faith and works justifie in the same kind of causality*, viz. *as* Causæ sine quibus non, *or mediate and improper causes*; or (*as Dr.* Twisse) causæ dispositivæ, &c. *The like may be said of Love, and of others in the same station.*

These are but meer affirmations, and contain no reasons to confirme, only in the latter *Thesis*, seemingly at least, is produced the authority of that Antinomian Dr. *Twisse*: but with so fine a conveyance as that he may be kept in or left out at pleasure if Mr. *Baxter* be dealt with to make good his allegation of him. He knowes the name and authority of Dr. *Twisse* to be great and amiable, as an eminent servant of Christ, and patron of his truth. He concludes therefore that his assertions will be swallowed with the more facility having such an authority to sweeten and fortifie them. Therefore so interserteth his Testimony, that his Reader may suppose Dr. *Twisse* to affirm works to be *causas dispositivas* of justification. I neither have read all that Dr. *Twisse* hath written, neither do I so far trust my memory, as to deny it flatly and peremptorily. Yet by knowing Dr. *Twisse* aright, I am as confident that *Bellarmine* hath taught the righteousnesse of justification to be meerly by imputation, and our justification only by faith, as that Dr. *Twisse* hath any way affirmed works in this or any other respect to prevent or operate to our justification. If he did, why doth not Mr. *Baxter* quote the place, elsewhere he doth very diligently when the Testimony of the Author makes for him? or why in the end of his Appendix where he sucks out of Dr. *Twisse* and others, all that he thinks may make for his advantage, doth he not cite this so pregnant Testimony? But he hath left to himself an evasion, that when he hath beguiled whom he can with such an authority, being found at last, he can answer his meaning is, the term or phrase, (*causa dispositiva*) upon some other, not to this Argument, is that which Dr. *Twisse* useth. I finde him indeed calling works *causas sine quibus non*; or *dispositivas salutis*, of our salvation or glorification, never of our justification: And so far is he from ac-

but

buting under this term what Mr. *Baxter* attributeth, that he seriously abandoneth it. So he expresseth himself, *Vind. Lib. 1. Part. 2. Sect. 2. Proxime finem. Vix majus peccatum est quam justificationem quærere ex operibus*: and almost in the next words, *Nullum opus Deo gratius & acceptius est, quam sibi & justitiæ suæ in negotio salutis renunciare, et in Christo unice confidere.* But come we now to that which he speaks for confirmation, the first part consists in prefacing. His own conscience telling him that it is a Pharisaicall, Popish principle which he hear positeth, he forelayes his Proeme to the proofe thereof thus;

B. *I know this is the doctrine that will have the loudest out-cries raised against it: and will make some cry out, Heresie, Popery, Socinianism, and what not? For mine own part the searcher of hearts knoweth, that not singularity, affection of novelty, nor any goodwill to Popery, provoketh me to entertain it; but that I have earnestly sought the Lords direction upon my knees, before I durst adventure on it, and that I resisted the light of this conclusion as long as I was able; but a man cannot force his own understanding, if the evidence of truth force it not, though he may force his pen or tongue to silence or dissembling. That which I shall do further is to give you some proofs*, &c.

First, here a word to such Ministers as being more the disciples of men then of Christ, and better versed in Sophistry then Divinity, do only not deify Mr. *Baxter*, maintaining all his doctrine in this book to be the doctrine of all the Protestant Churches. Why do they anger the man in charging him with so low a spirit, that he hath nothing but what is common with him and the most eminent lights in the Church? will not he be offended at it? doth he not here in some kind pronounce himself a dissenter? and that what he here asserteth is that which the Protestant Churches detest as heresie? doth not himself even before experience what acceptance his book would have, as it were proclaime himself in this point departed from us into the Tents of Papists and Socinians?

As to Mr. *Baxter*, 1. We have before granted to him that he gives no cause of suspicion that affection of singularity and novelty hath drawn him into this opinion. For he is not herein singular, nor is his doctrine new, but such as the Phariſees in Christs time, and the false Apostles in the Apostles times, and the worst of Hereticks from thence unto our dayes have unanimously pette-

red the Church with. Yet in this I appeal to Mr. *Baxter* whether some affectation of repute by being a deviser of a new way and new Arguments for the confirmation of this old Popish, Socinian doctrine hath not possessed him?

2. Whether the searcher of all hearts witnesse for him that no good will to Popery in generall provoked him to trouble the Church with his doctrine, I will not judge: But if good will to this part of Popery that consists in justification by works, (unto which if all the rest garbage of Popery be compared, it is insufficient to counterpoise it in mischief) did not provoke, let him shew what hath provoked him to it. Is it in hatred to the Papists that he hath laboured so stoutly to maintain their Kingdome? Is not this the pillar of all Popery? and if this be demolished what is there of all their heresies but will fall after?

3. As to his sincerity in this businesse in following conscientiously his judgment; I know, I finde in my self, *the heart is deceitfull above all things and desperately evill, who can finde it out?* I search only my own not anothers heart, that is out of my orb, and beyond my fathom. But I should give the more credence to Mr. *Baxter* speaking of his own sincerity in this businesse, did I not see him forsaking the fountain, and digging to himself cisterns, deriving from every puddle of Papists, Arminians, Socinians and Atheists, both his tenents, and all fallacious Sophistry to maintain them, leaving the pure word of God, and tossing it either from him, or for himself at his pleasure.

4. As for his prayer if presented to God after his own principles as an Act helping to justifie him, and no further, through the mediation of Christ, then as the same mediation takes efficacy (as to him) from his own works and worth; no marvell if the justice of God flung it back as dirt in his face, and left him to that deluding spirit which worketh by those false Apostles whom he had studied so many years, having spent but a few days upon the Scriptures as himself confesseth. So the Pharisee after his praying departed from the presence of God, unjustifyed, unregarded. Such devout Protestations may possibly take impression upon the weak and ignorant: But Satan in the vizzard of an Angell of light, and Satan in his own ghastly visage, is to them that are strong in the faith, the same Satan and alike shunned. Besides when men rest not satisfyed with the sacred truth of the Word, but will as it were rake the very dung of Gods enemies for

quaintifies of knowledge which the Word hath not; if they be blacked no marvell, for their delight is to dwell with Colliers. And God hath threatned *to send them strong delusions that they should beleeve a lie*, &c. 2 *Thes.* 2. 10, 11, 12. *Yeelding them up to more worse, deceiving others, being themselves deceived or self-deceivers*, 2 *Tim.* 3. 13.

He promiseth some proofs of what he saith, and one argument he puts in this explication, thus,

B. *If faith justifie as it is the fulfilling of the condition of the new Covenant, and obedience be also part of the condition; then obedience must justifie in the same way as faith: But both parts of the Antecedent are before proved.*

An Herculean Argument, as soon may a man wrest the Club out of *Hercules* his hand, as make void the conclusion which is inferred by this Argument. If my eye discerneth colours upon condition it look diligently upon them, and my hand doth inrich me upon condition that it stretcheth forth it self to receive a Princes beneficence, and my heel be put into the same condition with my eye and my hand, then my heel doth discerne colours in the same way with my eye, and enrich me in the same way with my hand: But both parts of the Antecedent are as fully proved before, as the both parts of Mr. *Baxters* antecedents. But the conclusion is as very a blank as Mr. *Baxters*.

If Mr. *Baxters* oft saying of the same thing doth prove the thing to be true, then this cannot be denyed to be a truth. For who can number the times that he hath kissed and spit in the mouth of this Ashteroth Condition, setting it up cheek-mate with Christ himself in justifying us. For *Thes.* 56. he yoaks together Christ and faith in the same way of causality to justification, and here and every where faith and obedience or works, so that Christ, faith and works are collaterals in justifying, how? as they meet together in this one Great Colossus condition, or *causa sine qua non*. Christ is the condition, (even in his satisfaction) and faith is the condition, and works is the condition: so that Condition (it seems by him) justifyeth more then works, or faith, or Christ: for neither works alone, nor faith alone, nor Christ, alone doth justifie. But this *mouth-almighty Condition, when like Bel and the Dragon*, she hath eaten up and swallowed into her bowels, Christ, faith, and works, doth of, and by her self alone justifie, such a Justifyer, and such a Justification. I should speak more seriously,

if Mr. *Baxter* had miniſtred to me more ſerious matter whereof to treat. Chaffe is wont to be expoſed to the winde when the Wheat as more ſubſtantiall is allotted to a more ſubſtantiall handling.

The reſt of his Arguments which he brings in other *Theſes*, I ſhall examine by themſelves.

Chap. VI.

The fift Argument anſwered, and the diſpute of St. James *Cap.* 2. *opened, and the Reaſons drawn thence to prove juſtification by works, refuted.*

THe former was Mr. *Baxters* great Argument, the fift in number is like to it, yet not ſo much hugged and honoured by him as the former, becauſe that was his own, born of his own brain: This he takes up as fully formed by the Papiſts to his hand and uſe, ſo that he is not to have the entire honour of it, but every petty Monk and Sacrificer will challenge his part therein. This is indeed their *great and ſole* Argument againſt the Proteſtants. The reſt they bring is unworthy the hearing. This therefore Mr. *Baxter* here, that the Popiſh cauſe may ſtand and our fall, *Atlas*-like, puts his ſhoulder and whole ſtrength under to ſupport.

B. Theſ. 75. pa. 292.

The plain expreſſion of St. James *ſhould terrifie us from an interpretation contradictory to the Text, and except apparent violence be uſed with his Chap.* 2. 21, 24, 25. *&c. it cannot be doubted but that a man is juſtifyed by works and not by faith only.*

Euſebius, Hieron. **Eraſmus, Luther, Muſculus, Cajetan* a Cardinall of the Romiſh

I mean not here to ſeek an evaſion by pleading that this Epiſtle in the primitive times of the Church, before the controverſie about juſtification by faith, or by works and faith was in agitation, was queſtioned by ſome and denyed by others to be of divine authority. Or that * ſome great Divines of theſe latter times have not received it into the *Canon*; or that among thoſe that embrace it as Canonicall, it is much diſputed what *James* is the

Authour

thour of it? For (besides the *Syriac* interpreter that weakly tributes it to *James* the brother of *John* who in the cradle of e Church was slain with the sword by *Herod*, *Act.* 12.1, &c.) ome name *James* the son of *Alpheus* the Brother of Christ, and ne of the 12 Apostles: others, *James* sirnamed *Oblias*, or the ast, (of whom *Josephus* writeth, the Author of it; *& adhuc sub dice lis est*: Or that the matter, method and (if I may so eak) spirit of this Epistle, sounds not in one harmony with e rest parts or books of the new Testament, but rather after e writings of the books under the old Covenant, or after such stuck still to the old Covenant, as *Philo Judæus* and others: ll which Mr. *Baxter* better knows to have been by many objected, en I know how satisfactorily to answer it) By these and other asons some have expunged it from the Catalogue of Scriures which are of divine inspiration, and have reduced it into e kind and number of writings that are usually termed Ecclestical; in a good sense, not disagreeing any where from the st, yet not of that dignity as to be accepted as a part of the n it self.

I shall leave these things to be disputed by others, and examine e testimonies which Mr. *Baxter* hence alleageth what and w far it makes for him, as the authority of the holy Ghost mselfe.

Here it is remarkable that Mr. *Baxter* who followes the Jesuits ery foot and inch in the interpreting of this and all other Scriures from which he would with them set up justification by orks, like a man made all of zeal, perks up to terrifie us from interpretation contradictory to the text, and from using parent violence to it; implying that all the Protestant Churches d Saints which have stood in the defence of the faith of Christ inst the Papists, now almost 200. years, have dealt thus sacrilegiously in robbing this Text of its due sense: And the yers and Jesuites alone (good men) have stood up as the fast ends of Christ, to maintain this truth of Christ, and the spirit d meaning of this Scripture, against the violation of the sacriious hands of these hereticall Protestants: And that himis now at last stirred up by the Spirit that hath wrought so erfully upon the Jesuits, to vindicate and set forth the true aning of this Text, with the same fidelity and sincerity which y his Masters have used before him. Therefore to excite all

men to gaze on his ingenuity and sincerity, and to admire him as the one alone man among Protestants raised up to undeceive all the Churches that have so long strayed from the holy mother Church, he thus like wisedome it self uttereth his voice.

B. *Pag.* 297. *I dare not teach the holy Ghost to speak; nor for to the Scripture; nor raise an exposition so far from the plain import and of the words without apparent necessity: but here is not the least necessity there being not the least inconvenience that I know of, in affirming justification by works, in the fore explained sense* (*i. e.* in the sense which Mr. *Baxters* sense and reason without any help of Scripture hath devised.) *Men seldome are bold with Scripture in forcing it, but they are first bold with conscience in forcing it*, as one M. *Baxter*, who with one spell, hath forced all the large and divine disputes of *Paul* about justification into a cherristone, and hurld it at the feet of his St. *Sense*, there to do homage, or to be trampled into the dirt.)

After this his protestation of his integrity, zeal and tenderness of conscience in interpreting Scriptures, and the impression which he feels or feigns in his soul which the heretick Protestants have made by not expounding this Scripture in the same words which the Jesuits do: Let us see with what tenderneſſe and sincerity himself in the next words speaketh of it.

B *If it were but some one phrase dissonant from the ordinary language of Scripture, I should not doubt but it must be reduced to the rest. But when it is the very scope of a Chapter, in plain and frequent expressions no whit dissonant from any other Scripture; I think he that may wrest it, as to make it unsay what it saith, may as well make him a Creed of his own, let the Scripture say what it will to the contrary. What is this but with the Papists to make the Scripture a nose of wax. If St.* James *speak it so over and over, that justification is by works and not by faith only, I will see more cause before I deny it; or say by means a working faith.*

He that in all this can see one least spark of that professed sincerity which he protesteth in himself and requires in others worthier then himself, let him make it out: I can see nothing else but fraud, doubleneſſe and falshood.

1 When he sayeth that it is the very scope of a Chapter and not only some one phrase that here holds forth justification by works before God, it is the same which he hath from *Bellarmine*, *Scopus Jacobi* (saith he) *fuit demonstrare fidem veram atque Cath-*

Bel. lib. 1. de justif. cap. 15.

lic

tam ad salutem sine operibus non sufficere, &c. *i. e.* The scope of *James* in this Chapter was to shew that a true and Catholick faith is not sufficient without works to salvation; and with as much truth and fidelity doth this man speak it, as did the other from whom he learned it. This being no more the scope of this Chapter or of *James* in it, then to deny the salvation which is by Christ, and to set on men to seek it by the Law.

2 That this phrase of justification by works [in Mr. *Baxters* sense] is no whit dissonant from any other Scripture, whether he means difference in sound, or difference in substance, is as very a paradox, as if he had said that contradictories are not dissonāt. For if this doctrine after Mr. *Baxters* sense must stand as true doctrine, and for the Gospell of Christ, then must we cast away almost if not altogether all the other Scriptures of the new Testament as heretical; and limit our selves to this alone, and to Mr. *Baxters* glosse in it to learn true righteousnesse and the way to life. For how vain, empty and audacious his annihilating of *Pauls* doctrine about justification with one breath is, we shall see in its proper place; and finde that he destroyes the genuine scope and meaning of that Apostle in many of his Epistles to sacrifice all, to his imaginary scope of *James* in some few words here delivered.

3 When he tels us of wresting and making a Creed, &c. he proclaims to the World that all the Protestant Churches which have constantly defended justification by faith without works, *i. e.* by Christ Jesus apprehended by faith without concurrence of works, &c. have wrested and violated the Scripture, set up a Creed of their own in despight of the Scriptures speaking to the contrary. For what he cunningly and seemingly fastens upon me Mr. *Pemble*, he layes to the charge of all the Protestant Churches, there being not one of them that hath not at all times held and spoken the same things with Mr. *Pemble*. And so pronounceth the faith of Christ to have been no where found, but within the confines of *Rome*; and that the Protestant Churches are all heretical and apostates, have rejected the faith of Christ, and sought righteousnesse and salvation by a Creed of their owne making.

4 Nevertheless his sincerity in the very next words after his such stout pleading for the Papists, fals foul with them for making the Scripture a nose of wax: to delude the simple with an opinion

opinion that he hath no confederacy with them. Yet

5 Holds them fast by the hand telling us that he will joyn wi
them and follow *James* in their sense and interpretation to se
justification by works and not by faith only.

But let us come to the text it self and see whether St. *Jam*
will be brought to dance after St. *Bellarmine* and Mr. *Bax*
with all their piping and charming, and in this, the sincerit
of these two great champions in the interpreting of this Scrip
ture will appear.

First for the scope of the Words, who can better expresse i
then the Author? This himself declares to be the subversion o
the false confidences of shadie beleevers, who being destitute o
true faith gloried in the meer shadow and profession of it, a
if it should justifie and save them, though it never wrought t
their Sanctification, but left them to every good work repro
bate. Against this pernicious delusion he bends the whole drift o
his dispute, and proveth such a faith to be vain, dead, devillish
and on the contrary, that the faith which justifyeth is lively an
operative in good works. This will be manifested in examinin
the severall passages of the dispute, specially to him that wil
take the labour of reading but some of the many hundreds o
our Divines that have answered the Arguments of the Papis
hence deduced; either in their Commentaries upon this Epistle
or in handling this Controversie against them. And herein som
of the learned among the Papists are more plyant to obey an
lesse stubborn to resist the truth then Mr. *Baxter*. The scope o
the Apostle (saith *Cajetan*) is to shew, *quod non fide sterili sed fecund*
justificamur; *i. e.* that we are justifyed not by a barren but frui
full faith. Thus do we finde *James* himself stating the question
ver. 14. *What doth it profit, though a man say he hath faith and hath n*
works, shall his faith save him? It is against *the saying* and false pro
fessing of *faith*, that hath no force or life to bring forth goo
works, and not against faith indeed which worketh by love th
the Apostle here argueth, denying to it any efficacy to justifica
tion: this is the thing which we shall finde him prosecutin
throughout his whole disputation: and on the contrary part a
firming faith which is living and active to good works to be all
alive and effectuall to justifie. This will more properly offer i
self to be made out in the next place. Let us then come to examin
Mr. *Baxters* dispute from the authority of *James*; *Pag.* 293.

B.

Br. *In opening this I shall first shew the clearnes of that in Iames for the point in question. &c.*

This he goeth about to doe by dashing in peeces all whatsoevēr hath been sayd by all or any of the Protestant Churches or Writers against the Papists in expounding this Text, thus.

B. *The ordinary expositions of St. Iames are these two. 1. That he speaks of Justification before men, and not before God. 2. That he speaks of works, as justifying our Faith, and not as justifying our persons: (or as Mr.* Pembles *phrase is) The Apostle when he saith Works justifie, must bee understood by a Metonymy, that a working faith justifieth. That the former exposition is false may appear thus.*

This is his shewing the clearnesse of that in St. James, *viz.* to anathematize all that any of the faithfull servants and Martyrs of the Lord Jesus within the Protestant Churches have spoken in the Exposition therof, that it may bee embraced by all after the Catholick that is Romish interpretation. Two things wee except against in this his clarifying passage. 1. That being very good both at confounding and dividing, as hee sees either to make for his turn, hee doth heer by dividing seek to pervert, as erewhile by confounding we found him to obscure the truth. Why doth he make two opinions, two expositions heer of that which is but one? Hath he learned of Matchiavel so to deal in spiritualls, as hee prescribes in Politicks, *Divide & impera?* Why els should hee set at division those that are united? Or make them to fight one against another, who speak the same things? Or set in opposition *Iohn* against *Calvin*, and *Calvin* against *Iohn?* Or *David* against *Parens*, and *Parens* against *David?* And so other thousands, when every of these gives both these expositions which he mentioneth, in one. Possibly as to some particulars in this question he may meet with some particular Writer urging the one onely, but he knowes that most, and those not the meaneſt, make use of both, as shalbe shewed. 2. Wee except against him that in alleadging these expositions, he doth subtelly hide the grounds upon which the Protestants doe fix these their expositions. And thus he exposeth them to the vulgar at least, as groundless dreams, shifting evasions, wherof no reason can be given on our part: That all the reason lieth on the Papists part, with whom therfore he hath joyned. Is this Christian, or Jesuiticall dealing? Would it not bee expected from him that professeth himselfe a Protestant and zealous Presbyterian, when he divides himselfe

utterly from them, all them, of whose side hee professeth himselfe to be, at least to set down their opinions and grounds thereof, and to confute those grounds; and not (as hee doth) deny and fight against the conclusion without speaking a word to the premisses.

What he therefore fraudulently omits I shall heer supply, rendring the expositions as our Divines give it and the grounds of it, and not as Mr. *Baxter* corrupts it. We have found him acknowledging, that *if it be but some one phrase dissonant from the ordinary language of Scripture, that one must bee reduced to the rest, and not all the rest to that one.* pa. 297. So stands the case heer. The ordinary language, yea drift of the New Testament, is to hold forth Justification by faith without works (as wee have seen before) and every one that will but consideratively reade as other the Evangelists, so chiefly the Gospell written by Iohn the Apostle, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles to the Romans, to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Hebrews especially and above the rest, and withall from the rest it must needs appeare. This one passage in one Epistle hath a sound of differing & but a soūd Must al be reduced to this or this to all? Aceording to the rule therefore allowed by Mr. *Baxter* himselfe, our Divines give an interpretation to this one passage, that may declare it, (though it hath a seeming,) yet not to have a reality of dissent from the rest. Because if this be Canonicall and from the H. G the H. G. cannot contradict himselfe.

In expounding this dispute of *James*, therefore the Protestants take notice of a two fold homonymy of words, one in the word *Faith*, the other in the word *Justifying*, both which Paul and *James* use, but use them the one in one, and the other in another sence, so that though they seeme somwhat to differ in words, yet in sense they speake the same thing.

1. They say as when Paul speakes of Faith to justification, by *Faith* he meanes a true and lively Faith, which fetcheth power from the merits of Christ to Iustifie, and from the spirit of Christ to Sanctifie: so Iames here battereth under the name of Faith, a bare profession and boasting of Faith, which some Hypocrites leaned on to Iustifie them, being wholly destitute of Faith indeed that is alive, and effectuall to draw from Christ matter both to Iustification and Sanctification. 2. They say that as Paul takes the word *Iustifying* for remission and absolution before God, so *James* takeait (as oft as he requires here works to Iustifie) for the declaration of the truth of our Faith, and Iustification before men.

Yet

Yet let not this their distinction (if it may fitly be so termed) and exposition bee taken up unlesse it hath sufficient grounds from the Text to beare it up. I shall begin first with the latter, because Mr. *Baxter* there begins. That Justification by works is by *James* understood the declaring us to man, to have true Faith and to be Iustified by it, they bring these reasons to prove. 1 *James* himselfe even in expresse words affirming it ver. 18 Shew me thy Faith without thy workes, and I will shew thee my Faith by my works, where he tels us that by Iustifying, he means the shewing or declaring our Faith, and Justification (not to God) but one to another. And thus he denieth Faith which is not *Shewed by Works*, to Iustifie *i. e.* to *Shew* or declare us to men Iustified 2. ver. 21, where he saith, was not *Abraham* our Father justified by works, when he had offered *Isaack* his Son upon the Altar? doth he speake of Gods Iustifying him, or declaring him to be justified, unto men? Not the former, for God had justified him by Faith many yeares before, and there was no disruption (according to Mr *Baxters* doctrine) in the intervall, by any apostacy made by *Abraham*, that of justified he became unjustified; and needed here to be justified anew. How then was hee justified by offering his Sonn? Can there be any other way not repugnant to reason devised, but this; that God here by proving and bearing him up in so searching a proof and Temptation, to shew so merciles an act of obedience, did declare to the world that his Faith was in sincerity, his feare and love unfained, so that all must be restrayned from charging him with selfe respects and Hypocrisy, in all the professions that he made towards God; Or what less is to be drawn from those words from Heaven Gen: 22 12. upon this act of *Abrahams* obedience, Now I know that thou feareſt God seeing thou hast not witheld thy Son, thy onely Son from me? Did not God know what was, what himselfe had wrought in *Abrahams* hart before this tryall of him? doth he need outward actions to manifest to him what is in the heart within? Mr. *B.* so much cleavs to thē that make all things wth God doth to flow from his prescience that he will not ungod God so much as to deny that he knew as perfectly before as after tryall: Why saith he then, now I know, but to intimate that now he had given a strong evidence both to the present and future generations to know that God knew, and therby to convince men of all ages that they also must know the truth of *Abrahams* Faith, feare, and justification? 3. The same might bee said of *Rahabs* justification by workes, in receiving the Messengers, Gen. 15. 6.

and letting them forth another way. ver. 25. Did such a work as this justifie her before God? or obtain to her remission of sins, and deliver her from everlasting vengeance? when there cannot be the least probable conjecture that shee had then any Faith in Christ, or had ever heard of a Christ to come? Then let us disclaime that *Fabulam de Christo* (as one of the Popes termed the Gospell) Righteousnes is by workes without Faith, without Christ, and *Stapletons* glosse upon Pauls *Justificamur fide, i. e. non absq; fide*, we are justified by Faith *i. e.* not without Faith, because Faith is necessary to justification, though not without works sufficient to it; must be rejected as too Evangelicall. And then also how shal Mr: *Baxters Thesis* not fal which makes workes collateralls with Faith in Christ to justification? workes can do it without Christ. But if all this intrench upon Blasphemy, then was shee justified by workes to men, to the *Israelites*, who by this Act toward them had so farr evidenced her fidelity to them and their cause, that thereupon shee was taken into Covenant with them, delivered from the ruine which befell *Iericho*, and after as it were adopted or naturallized into the Commonwealth of *Israell*. Ye have one part of the exposition and the grounds of it, which Mr: *Baxter* concealed, that the unwary reader might despise it as groundlesse. Mr: *Baxter* opposeth it, tells us it is false, and it may appeare thus.

Stapleton, Antid. p. 82. 83.

B. p. 294. *The Worlds Justification frees us but from the worlds Accusation, to which it is opposed: And therefore it is but either a Justification from Mans Laws; or else a particular Justification of us in respect of some particular Faults; or else an usurped Judgement and Justification: for they are not constituted our Judges by God: and therefore wee may say with* Paul, *it is a small thing with me to be judged of you or of mans judgement. And so a small thing to be justified by men from the accusations of the Law of God.*

But the justification in James, *is of greater moment as appears in the Text. For* 1. *It is such as salvation depends on. ver.* 14.

2. *It is such as followeth only a saving Faith. But the World may as well justifie us when we have no faith at all.*

Iherefore affirm, 1. *That the world is no lawfull judge of our righteousnes before God, &c.* 2. *Nor a competent capable judge and cannot passe any certain true sentence, &c.* 3. *If they could, yet works are no certain Medium, or evidence,*

dence, wherby the world can know us to bee righteous. For there is no outward work which an hypocrite may not perform: and inward works they cannot discern, &c. So that if it bee not certain that the Text speaketh of justification before God, I scarce know what to be certain of.

It were more tolerable and excusable for me to leave the grounds of one single man giving his private interpretation of this Scripture, despised unexamined, and unanswered; than for him so to deale with all the Churches of Christ: But I will not be a follower of him that followes not Christ in lowlinesse, and his Precept in selfe-deniall.

His dispute here is two fold; 1 to prove that *James* speaks not, of the declaration of our justification before men. 2. To prove that he speaks of our justification before God, when he mentioneth justification by works.

To the former all that he saith is Sophisticall and Fallacious. For if wee grant that by the World hee meanes the whole generation of men both good and evill (which yet can hardly bee drawne from his dispute, which to make our assertion odious would make it out as relating only to the wicked of the world, that these must be the alone Judges,) Notwithstanding his whole Argumentation is a meer ἐτεροζήτησις a waving the question with a false assumption that by Justification before men, we meant a raising of a Tribunall upon earth, in opposition to Gods in heaven, there to set up men to be judges, and to passe sentence of justification and remission of sinnes one upon another, according to the evidence of every ones works. The falshood wher of hee proves by the illegality of such a judicature, and incompetency of the judges, and evidence for it. And what is this but a Devill of his own raysing and laying again? For what one rationall man in any of the Reformed Churches ever dreamed of such a justification? All that wee understand heerby is but a declaration and discovery of the tree by its fruits, of the state of a man before God, that he hath justified or not justified him, according as we see the fruits of justification, *i. e.* the works of sanctification following or not following the profession of faith. And all this not by a judiciall sentence given for or against any, nor by the judgement of infallible faith or knowledge; but in the judgement of charity alone, which hopeth all things, beleeveth all things, thinketh no evill, (except by strong evidence it bee drawn to it) 1. Co. 13. 5. 7.

In fighting against this doctrine Mr. *Baxter* fighteth against Christ, against the Holy Ghost the Author of it, not onely heer, but elsewhere also. *By their fruits ye shall know them,* saith our Saviour, Mat. 7. 16. *By this shall all men know that ye are my Disciples, if ye love one another,* Io 13. 35. *that the World may know that thou hast loved them,* Io: 17. 28. *He that is of God heareth us, he that is not of God heareth us not, hereby know we the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Error,* 1. Io 4. 6. *Let your light so shine forth before others that they seeing your good workes may glorifie your Father which is in Heaven,* Mat: 5. 16. *I magnifie my office if by any meanes I may provoke my bretheren &c. and save some of them.* Ro. 11. 14. *By your orderly carriage, &c. the unbeliever shall be convinced, fall down worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth,* 1. Cor. 14. 24. 25. *That he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having nothing evill to say of you,* Tit. 2. 8. *Having your conversation honest among the Gentiles, that whereas they speake evill of you, they may by your good works which they see, glorifie God,* 1 Pet. 2. 12. *Because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of God to blaspheme,* 2. Sam. 12. 14. *God hath begun, and will perfect in you the good work as it is meet for me to judge of you, because, &c.* Phil. 1. 6, 7. I am *perswaded of you things that accompany salvation, because of your works and labours of love, &c.* Heb. 6. 9, 10. *Wee give thanks to God for you, &c. since we heard of your Faith in Christ Jesus, and love to all the Saints, for the hope which is laid up for you in Heaven,* Col. 1. 3, 4, 5, *To the Saints which are at Rome, Corinth, &c.* and hundreds of the like Scriptures which testifie the declaration, such a declaration of the Faith, Saintship, Justification and salvation of others by the evidence of their works, that we ought, that it is a sinne in men by the judgement of Charity not to acquiesce therein: And on the contrary part, testifying the want of such an evidence to be an occasion given to all men to reject our Faith and justification in the profession thereof as spurious and vaine. Against all these Mr. *Baxter* excepteth, pronouncing that mans judgement herein is illegall, incompetent, and the evidence insufficient, therefore to make use of any judgement or discerning in this kind, is usurpative. Doth he herein fight against men, or against God? Suppose that the event in any thing prove contrary to our judgement, yet is there not sin in such judgement, while we follow Christs Rule, and to be deceived by Charity rightly ordered, if it may be called a deceivednesse, yet is it no sinfull deceivednesse. What hee produceth

fro

from the Apostle, *Unto me it is a small thing to be judged of you, or of mans judgement,* &c. 1 Cor. 4. 3. is nothing subservient to his purpose: For the Apostle there speaketh of their unjust Censures of him, besides and against Christs Rule, the Rule of Charity, (from which while they erred, their judgement was not to be regarded) and in relation to the future judgement which followes not mans, but Christs owne knowledge of us. Thus have we found one part of his arguing vaine and wide from the scope, in going about to prove that *James* his Justification by works is not to be taken for the declaring of us to men to be truly justified.

His second dispute is to prove that this Justification by Works is to be understood of our justifying by works at Gods Tribunall. His Reasons to prove it are partly in his words before transcribed, partly in a new supply thereunto added. The first Reason in the former is,

B. 1. *It is such as Salvation dependeth on.* vet. 14.

Brevis esse laboro, Obscurus fio.

No mans immoderate prolixity and tediousnes hath ever so much troubled mee, as this mans pretended affectation of conciseness and brevity. By it, when hee speakes nothing, he gets the advantage to bee thought of fooles, that he speaketh great and mysticall things. Were it not that I regard such as are too apt to run after his whistle though they know not his tune, I should rather kick at such Delphicke mysticall passages of his, than take them up to looke on them. If *James* here take not justifying and saving for the same thing, then (to use Mr. *Baxters* words) I am not certaine what to be certaine of. So that when he saith it is such a justification as salvation dependeth on, it is one as if hee had said it is such a justification as justification dependeth on, or such a salvation as salvation dependeth on. The Apostle there speaks of a dead and barren Faith, of a profession not a being of Faith, and by an interrogation bearing the force of a strong Negation, by saying, Can Faith, for the saying that he hath Faith, save him? he means, and saith, it cannot save him: and that is the same with him, as if he had said, it cannot justifie him. Here wee have indeed an idle dreame of Faith that cannot save. But a Justification that cannot justifie, or cannot save, or can justifie and not save, is as far from *James* as neare to Mr. *Baxter.*

B. 2. *It is such as followeth only a saving faith. But the world may as well justifie us when we have no Faith at all.*

That

That the justification of the New Covenant in which God evi denceth by faith to us that we are justified in Christ, or the justifi cation which consisteth in the evidencing by works to men the truth both of our Faith and Gospel Justification, so far that in charity they are to regard us as truly beleeving, and truly justified; do not follow either saving faith, or that which in charity to them that pro fess it, men are to account a saving faith: none denieth. But it will not hence follow, that works justifie us at Gods Judgement seat because they follow faith that declareth and evidenceth us to our selves to be so justified. He comes with a new supply pa. 296.

B. *Once more: 1. Was Abraham justified before men for a secret Action? 2. Or such an Action as the killing of his only Son would have been?*

1. Had the Action been kept secret from men, it could not have justified him before God or men. Not before God, for no actions as actions are the ground of his justifying us (as hath bin already abundantly proved.) Nor before men: for this action could not have declared the truth of his faith to them that never heard of the man or his Action. But God having ordeyned him to bee a Father of the Faithfull, and pattern of all beleevers to the worlds end, and to confer Blessednes with Abraham, upon all that walk in the steps of the Faith of our Father Abraham. Ro. 4. 9. 12. hath recorded this Action of his, to justifie and magnifie the truth of his Faith to all that in all ages shall beleeve, and to incite them by his patterne by the like eminent obedience to justifie their Faith also to others.

2. We are not to enquire what the evil world will judge of such an Action, but whether Abraham, or rather the spirit of God working in and by Abraham, did not give in this Action a sufficient demonstration to convince the evill world (much more the saints chosen out of the world) of the truth of his Faith. Which conviction if the evill world will carnally neglect or cursedly oppose, it shall leave them the more inexcusable in the day of Judgement.

B. *Was not he the Justifier then which was the imputer of Righteousnes? but God was the imputer of Righteousnes, ver. 23. Therefore God was the Justifier. So I leave that Interpretation to sleep.*

This is one of his extravagancies. He hath all this while disputed of Justification by works: what he cannot prove of works, now he proves of Faith. James saith, Abraham beleeved God, and it was imputed to him for righteousnes. Was it imputed to him of God for

for a partiall or for a perfect righteousnes? If but unto righteousnes in part, let him prove it, or stand guilty before God for perverting his word. If in the whole, then is there no place left for works to challenge a part. Or let him produce from James the like sentence of works imputed to Abraham to Righteousnes; else he puts the handle of his Argument into our hands to retort it upon him. Abrahams Faith was imputed to him [by the testimony of Iames] to righteousnes; *Ergo* [by the testimony of Iames] works were not so imputed to him.

So [his Epiphonem] *I leave that interpretation to sleep*, is the only sound thing that he hath spoken to this question. For he hath said nothing that hath any power to awaken much less to rowze it: *So that it may sleep*, and that securely and in safety, because they are but false Alarms that he soundeth against it.

The second interpretation (as Mr. *Br.* terms it) or as it is indeed the second homonymy or different sense of words, wherin our Divines affirm Iames and Paul to speak in sound one, but in meaning disagreeing eyther from other, is in the word [Faith] as hath been sayd. Paul when he attributes justification to Faith without works, means a living faith fruitfull in good works. Iames where he denies Faith without works to justifie, means a dead faith, a meer profession of faith that hath neither life nor being, much less fruitfulnes in good werks. That Iames takes the word Faith in this sense appears by these Reasons from the Text it selfe.

1. From the scope of his dispute which we shall find to be (as I sayd) to beat down the presumption of carnall professors, who reposed the hope of salvation wholly upon a bare profession of faith, though the faith wherof they boasted had no vertue to sanctification & obedience; and to prove that alone to be a justifying Faith which is alive to good works. This even *Cajetan* himself one of the pillars of the Romish Church, giveth as the scope of the Text, as I have shewed; & he further expresseth himself thus: *Adverte hic prudens Lector, quod Iacobus non sentit Fidem sine operibus mortuam esse &c. Quoniam constat nos per fidem justificari, etiam sine operibus, sed sentit fidem sine operibus*, i.e. *renuentem operâri, vel non paratam operari, esse mortuam, esse vanam, & non justificare.* That is, Let the prudent Reader heer note, that Iames means not that faith is dead without works [to accompany and help it in justifying us] for it is evident that faith justifieth, even without works: but his meaning is, that faith without works, that is, that refuseth or is not in a readines to

Cajetan in Jacob.

to good works, is dead, vain, and justifieth not. Thus he makes the scope of James heer to prove that an idle and fruitless faith is not a saving or justifying faith. So that we find it easier in this argument to find the truth from the very Papists than from Mr. *Br.*

2. From the 14. ver. where James putting the question of faith without works, saith not indefinitely, can faith, but annexeth the article to it, *ἡ πίστις, can this faith save?* Is there power in such a faith to save, which hath no power to sanctifie? In like maner as heere, ver. 20 What in our Translation is rendred faith [absolutely] is there also in the Originall put with the restriction of the same article [*that*] faith which is without works is dead.

3. From the attributes that he gives to the faith to which he denieth justification; *viz. a dead faith,* ver. 17. 20. 26. *A faith of Devils,* ver. 19. But a dead and Devillish faith are not a true Gospel faith, but at the best a figment and counterfeit thereof.

4. From the similitude by which he illustrateth his disputation: If a man in a pretence of charity, speaks comfortable words to his hungry and naked brother, Alas poor soul be cloathed, be filled, but ministreth nothing to him for his refreshing; will any call that flourish of words true charity? Is it any more then a paint therof? So also of him that saith hee hath faith, but evidenceth it not by its fruits &c. The verball faith doth no more profit to justification, than the verball charity to sanctification. If one of these in the mind of the Author be true charity, then according to the minde of the Author also, the other is true Faith,

5. From the object of that Faith which *James* excludeth from Iustification, Mr. *Baxter* acknowledgeth that the object of justifying Faith is Christ, *Thes.* 66.-68. and their explication. But let him shew that *James* doth here expressly or impliedly, in any one passage of his dispute, make Christ the object of that Faith which he excludes from justification: or any other object than the Faith of a meer Heathen or Hypocrite may pitch upon, *viz.* generall truths, that *there is a God &c.* else let him grant from his owne principles that it is not true Faith but an unprofitable Historicall Faith (as some terme it) which is here excluded.

Thus have our writers in answer to the *Papists Cavills,* expressed the minde of *James* in this place, or rather from him selfe declared what himselfe expresseth to be his minde and this they expresse (not as Mr. *Baxter* perverts them) by some one, but by both of these interpretations viz. of the word [justifying] and the word [Faith]

[Faith] manifesting out of *James* himselfe, that as oft as in this dispute he attributes justification to works, he speaks of justification *i.e.* the declaration or manifestation thereof to men. As when vers. 21 *Abraham*, and ver. 25. *Rahab* and ver. 24. A man indefinitely, are said to be justified by works, he meanes they are so manifested and declared by their works to us. This is a usuall phrase not only in Scripture, but in our common expressions and our common talk. I will justifie what I have spoken or done; *i. e.* I will declare it, make it appear to be all good, true, and just: I will justifie him from all that is layd to his charge, *i. e.* I will declare and prove him just and free from all that he is charged with. Again where hee denieth justification to that dead faith that worketh not by love: that by faith he means a false profession and counterfeit of, and not the true justifying faith: and who among us ever said, that to say, I have faith, (never expressing the power and fruits of it) can justifie a man? So there is nothing to be found in James crossing the Protestant, yea Evangelicall and Apostolicall conclusion, that we are justified [in our consciences before God] by faith alone without works, *i.e.* by a living and working, not a dead faith: yet without works can we not be declared and manifested just unto men.

That which Mr. *Br.* hath spoken against the former part of this interpretation, *viz.* justification before men, we have found to be either lesse or worse than nothing. To the other, *viz.* the denying of justification to faith that is a counterfeit, a false profession of faith, hee saith nothing; and why? because hee hath not what to say. Therfore he stifles it in darknes, will not have his Reader hear of it, for then *actum est*, he must run to S. *Francis*, or some other Saint, S. James leaves him in the mire. It is no lesse ludicrous than fallacious that he turns the state of the question another way, and daunceth round about it, never comming to that which our Divines answer. Having devised pag. 294 that we say James speaks of works as justifying our faith, not our persons, he doth pa. 296 goe about to prove that works justifie the person, not the faith only. And who ever denied this position? Doe not wee all say that the holy life declares the truth of faith, and therin justifieth (as to men) the professor of it from all hypocrisie in making such a profession? 2. pag. 297 he falls foul with the Ghost of sweet Mr. *Pemble*, for saying that by Faith and works *James* understands a working Faith. And after a sharp chiding, without examining his Reasons (the matter whereof I have before examined) at length p. 298. fetching breath;

he offers him peace and friendſhip, upon condition that he will ariſe from the grave & ſay what Mr. *Baxter* ſaith. But deſpairing of that, and concluding, if he ſhould riſe again from the dead, he would ſtill ſay with the Proteſtant Churches and Writers, that *Fides ſolùm juſtificat non autem fides ſola*: Faith alone juſtifieth, but not that Faith which is alone [without works,] becauſe that alone faith is not a true Faith; he 3. Makes a tranſition to fall out with all Proteſtant Churches, for attributing too much to Faith, in making it inſtrumentall to Iuſtification: that when Believers are ſaid to receive Chriſt, Io. 1. 12. and to receive abundance of Grace, and of the gift of Righteouſneſſe, Rom. 5. 17. wee will not ſay they receive this Chriſt, this gift of his Righteouſneſſe to Iuſtification, without any receiving inſtrument, but make Faith the inſtrument by which we receive the ſame. p. 299. A moſt pernicious Doctrine to Mr. *Baxters* Cauſe. If it ſtand Mr. *Baxters* Iuſtification by workes in the ſame relation with Faith as its Concauſe, muſt needs fall and tumble downe to hell, for works will not be bowed into any inſtrumentality to co-operate with Faith in receiving Chriſt and his righteouſneſs. When contrariwiſe, if we would ſay as he doth, and which we muſt take his word without any further demonſtration, to bee true, then in deſpite of Paul and the Holy Ghoſt, our juſtification ſhould be parted between faith and works, and Mr. *Brs.* new Goſpel ſtand, the Goſpel of Grace being wholly taken out of the way as unprofitable.

But in all that he ſaith, hee diligently keeps off from ſpeaking a word to what our Divines ſay in proving from James himſelfe, that he means not true faith when hee denies to the counterfeit or profeſſion of it any efficacy to juſtifie; and let the conſcientious Reader judge whether he doth this in zeal for Chriſt or againſt him? Let none except that poſſibly hee never read any of them that have thus expounded James. What one of them hath he then read? Nay I rather queſtion what one of them hath he not read? or with what one thing is he unacquainted that any of them hath written? He is a ſtranger to Mr. *Br.* that will accuſe him of little reading. Even Mr. *Pemble* himſelfe whoſe words hee can almoſt if not altogether rehearſe without book, gives it as the common interpretation of Proteſtant Writers, ſo that he cannot be ignorant of it. Yet he ſaith nothing to it, and ſaith all to what none denieth. Is this ſincerity in handling the chiefe point of mans ſalvation? Such as hee begged from God upon his knees? or the uſe of that which he injoyns upon

on

on us, tenderneſs in the interpretation of Scriptures? But we muſt leave him in his own way becauſe hee is reſolute therein. Sith hee will not anſwer us, let us anſwer him, in theſe things which in ſtead of an anſwer to us, he would fiſh from the Text for himſelf.

Br. pag. 299. 1. *When it is ſayd we are juſtified by works, the word* [*by*] *implieth more than an idle concomitancy, if they only ſtood by, while Faith doth all, it could not be ſayd wee are juſtified by works.*

We grant it doth much, yea almoſt all, in the juſtification whereof James there ſpeaks, *viz.* before men. And this is that which he ſpeaketh. ver. 21. 22. 23. of Abrahams juſtification by works, fulfilling that Scripture which ſayth, Abraham beleeved God, and it was imputed to him for righteouſneſs. How did his juſtification by works fulfill the Scripture which affirmed him to be juſtified by faith? but as this great work and fruit of his faith declared and manifeſted to men the truth of that Scripture, and the truth of his faith by which he was ſo many yeers before juſtified.

B. p. 300. 2. *When the Apoſtle ſaith,* [*by workes and not by faith onely*] *hee plainly makes them concomitant in the procurement, or in that kinde of cauſality which they have: eſpecially ſeeing he ſaith not as he is commonly interpreted,* [Not by Faith which is alone] *but* [By Faith onely.] καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον.

All is granted as before, of the juſtification before man. The profeſſion of Faith, or to ſay we have Faith is not ſufficient without declaring it by works ſo to juſtifie us. Therefore ſaith the Apoſtle, *Shew me* (if thou canſt) *thy Faith without thy works, and I will ſhew thee my Faith by my Works,* verſ. 18.

B. 3. *Therefore he ſaith that* [*Faith is dead being alone*] *becauſe it is dead to the uſe and purpoſe of juſtifying: for in it ſelfe it hath a life according to its quality ſtill. This appears from his compariſon in the former verſe, 16 that this is the death he ſpeaks of. And ſo works make Faith alive as to the attainment of its end of Juſtification.*

We grant that the hypocriticall profeſſion of Faith which *James* reproveth, is as all other ſinne, alive to condemne the unbelievers and unjuſtified, but dead to the uſe of juſtifying us in our conſciences before God, or outwardly before men. But that the addition of workes to ſuch a dead Faith can make it alive to juſtifie a man before God, we deny, neither doth *James* affirm; though there may

be some force that way to his justification before men, who are subject to failings in their judgement.

In the fourth place he findes something to say for, and something against the Analysis of *Piscator* and Mr. *Pemble*. When he would depresse it at the utmost, he can onely say that they *seeme to faile in the Explication of the 22. verse* about the συνέργεια, *Faiths working With Abrahams workes, and perfecting by workes.* In this I leave the Reader to peruse Mr. *Baxter*, and them whom hee opposeth, from thence to judge which party layes the surer ground of their interpretation. As to the question in hand, the working of both together to justifie and declare his faith perfect or sincere to men, doth nothing strengthen his assertion, or weaken ours.

The rest that hee hath in this Section are meere words without proofs: as also his Answer given to some Objections made on our part, and the same so curt, that the best examination of them is to leave them unexamined, untill he bring something to prove them. Yet what of all that hee saith heere hath, or seemes to have force to some other end, I may possibly in its proper place call it into Examination.

Chap. VII.

Argument. Mr. Baxters *sixth Argument to prove justification by works, drawne from the Identity of the Conditions of justification and salvation examined. To which are added the Rules which Protestant Writers give for the Right understanding of such Scriptures as promise eternall life to men of such works and qualifications: & an enquiry into the force of those Scriptures out of which M.:* Baxter *seeks to evince that eternall life runs upon condition of works.*

A Sixth Argument he draweth from the Identity of Justification and Salvation, in relation to the Condition of their procurement and attainment. He layes it thus. p. 310

B. Thes. 78 *Our full justification, and our everlasting Salvation have the same conditions on our part. But sincere obedience is without all Doubt, a condition of our salvation: Therefore also of our justification.* We

We except here against the Terms or Phrases used in the propo-sition, and that 1. against that which by way of distinction, hee names our [FULL] Justification, implying thereby that there is an empty, or at least partiall, maimed, and not full Iustification before God; as by what he hath oft said before, & by his own expressing himselfe, and his meaning in the Explication of his Thesis he makes evident. The Protestants utterly deny this 1. and 2. partiall, and full, unperfect and perfect Iustification, acknowledging one onely Iustification of the New Covenant, which (as an act of God) is *simul & semel*, perfect, admits of no degrees or increases, though as to a mans owne apprehension and comfort it hath its increases and decreases. And whatever Mr. *Baxter* hath hitherto brought to proove on his part, wee have found no lesse vaine than is that which hee seekes to prove. The Scripture is altogether ignorant of such a two fold Iustification, so that we leave it as Mr. *Baxters*, not Gods Iustification.

2. Against that which by the like way of distinction, hee calls our everlasting salvation, implying thereby a temporary salvation which is by Christ, in respect whereof the saved may be unsaved againe, and so the salvation which they have by Christ become transitory, not everlasting. Both these wee deny and detest as Popish, Socinian, and Arminian doctrines; what audaciousnesse is it in Mr. *Baxter* to name them, and not to prove them? to beguile his credulous Reader (not acquainted at all with Controversies) with an opinion that these things are knowne and granted by Protestants, who detest the hearing of them, and with unresistable arguments of Scripture oppugne the Authours of them: Wee shake off as prodigies in the Gospel Doctrine of Iustification and Salvation, the Attributes which hee giveth in that sence in which hee gives them. It is a bad Cause that seekes the support of Sophistry and fallaciousnes to support it. Truth loves to bee attended with simplicity and plainnesse, Let Mr. *Baxter* say why he puts these two distinguishing Attributes here; the thing in question reqaires them not. But his rotten Cause will receive no appearance of support by this Argument without them.

Againe as to the rest of his Argument, why doth hee assume and conclude otherwise than he proposed? The Proposition speaks of a *Full* Iustification, and an *Everlasting* Salvation, but the assumption of a Salvation only, and the conclusion of a Iustification only, without their Attributes of *Everlastingnesse* and *Fullnesse*, Doth he not know

know the falaciousneſſe of ſuch Arguings? why then doth he uſe it? Is it becauſe he is wholly made of it, and cannot ſhun it? or becauſe his Cauſe is ſuch that it cannot ſtand without it? that to uſe plaine dealing will diſcover the deformity of it? or for the congruity which ſuch a kind of Argumentation hath with the cauſe, fallaciouſneſſe with falſhood? Let him either propoſe what he aſſumeth and concludeth, or elſe aſſume and conclude as he propoſeth. And then he muſt argue one of the two wayes, either firſt thus:

Our Full Juſtification and our Everlaſting Salvation have the ſame Conditions on our part. But ſincere obedience is without all doubt a condition of our Everlaſting Salvation, Therefore alſo of our full Juſtification.

Here the arguing is regular, but it is about immaginary things, ſuch as neither the word nor the Churches of Chriſt are acquainted with. Wee deny that in Mr. *Baxters* ſence there is any *Full* Juſtification as oppoſite to a maimed, true Iuſtification, or any *Everlaſting Salvation* in his ſence, as oppoſite to a true ſpirituall ſalvation, that is temporary and tranſitory. So that his Arguing is the ſame as if he ſhould argue from *Jupiters* thunder to *Jupiters* lightning, or from *Bellerophons* horſe to *Bellerophons* ſaddle: when all theſe were Fictions, had their being only in immagination, not in reality.

Or ſecondly thus:

Our Juſtification and our ſalvation have the ſame conditions on our part. But ſincere obedience is without doubt a condition of our ſalvation: Therefore alſo of our juſtification.

Heere I diſtinguiſh the word ſalvation, that it is taken in Scriptures (when by it is meant the everlaſting ſalvation of the whole man by Chriſt,) ſometimes for the ſtate of grace which wee attaine here, ſometimes for the ſtate of glory above. In the former ſenſe we finde it, 2. Cor. 6. 2. *Now is the day of ſalvation*, Luk. 19. 9. *This day ſalvation is come to this houſe:* So Acts 28. 28. Rom. 11. 11. Heb. 6 9. and in other places. In which ſenſe we are ſaid to be ſaved when we effectually receive the word of Chriſt, and Chriſt Jeſus to whom that word directeth for Salvation. 1 Cor. 1 18. *To us that are ſaved*, Epheſ. 2. 5, 8. *By Grace ye are ſaved.* So 1 Cor. 15. 2. 2 Cor. 2. 15. 2 Tim. 1. 9 Tit. 3. 5. and elſewhere. In all which it is ſaid, wee *are* [not that we *ſhalbe*] ſaved: that Chriſt *hath* [not that he *will*] ſave us. And the ſame is further confirmed in the word *life*, where Believers are ſaid to *have life*, 1 Io. 5 12. *Everlaſting eternall life*, Io. 3. 36 and 5. 24. and 6. 6, 47, 54. *to be paſſed*

passed from death to life, Jo. 5, 24. All which proveth a life, eternall life, and everlasting salvation, in this world that cannot be lost, but shall have its coronation in glory above. In this sense wee grant the Proposition. so far as we have before granted any condition of justification. But we utterly deny the assumption. And what Mr. B. saith, sincere obedience is without all doubt a condition of Salvation, we affirme to be all the doubt, the whole thing in question. If it be granted of salvation in this sense, it must be granted of justification also. Because justification and salvation in this sense are not 2 things but one & the same. It being cal'd justification as we are freed & delivered from the state of misery considered as a state of sin: and salvation, as we are delivered from the same misery considered as a state of wrath and condemnation. To say therfore that our justification and salvation have the same condition, is all one as to say our justification and our justification; or our salvation and our salvation have the same conditions: and wee might as well assume and conclude hence, Obedience is a condition of our salvation, *Ergo* of our salvation also, as of our salvation *Ergo* of our justification also.

In the latter sense, if Mr. *Baxter* take salvation for our future glorification then we utterly deny the consequent of the proposition. It is false that he saith, justification and salvation have the same conditions. For what is a consequent of justification is an antecedent of salvation. And obedience [in Mr. *Baxters* sence] cannot be a condition without the position whereof God doth not justifie, because it followes justification and goeth not before it. And in this sense I have oft spoken before to the *minor*, and shal have occasion to speak again. But let us see how he goeth about to prove his *major* proposition.

B. Explic. p. 311. *The Antecedent is manifest in that Scripture maketh faith a condition of both Justification and Salvation: and so it doth obedience also as is before explained.*

How far any thing of this is true, there hath been given an Examination before, to his Explanations before.

B *Therefore are we justified that we may be saved.*

Wee grant more in aright sense, *viz.* that in being Justified, we are saved. But what of this?

B. *It would be as derogatory to Christs righteousnesse, if we be saved by works, as if we be justified by works.*

Therefore we reject both. And let Mr. *Baxter* look to himselfe for maintaining both.

B. *Neither is there any way to the former, but by the latter.*

The greater is his sin that teacheth such a way to justification as barres up the way to salvation, making it impervious and unpassible to Gods people. B. *That which a man is justified by he is saved by.* This is Christs mediation, or Christ the mediator, *for there is salvation in no other, nor any other name given us under Heaven by which we may be saved,* Act. 4. 12. *By the righteousness of* [this] *One, Grace came upon all to justification of life.* So we are saved by Christ, and not by Conditions.

B. *Though Glorification bee an adding of a greater happiness then we lost; and so justification is not enough thereto; yet on our part they have the same Conditions.*

This must be, because hee will have it to bee the result of all his dispute. But he only saith it, but proves it not. All that he layeth as the foundation of this Conclusion (excepting that which in other words is the conclusion it selfe) doth not infer it. For it being granted what he saith (but he weth not) that the Scripture saith it, that we are therefore justified that we may be saved, that there is no other way to salvation but by justification; and that it be as derogatory to Christs righteousnes, to be saved as to be justified by works: will it follow for all this, that justification and salvation have the same conditions on our part? The reasoning is one and the same in reason, as if I should thus argue: Having 1. slandered the Scriptures, and said, they say what I say, I should further proceed. Therefore are we created that we may be saved; neither is there any way to salvation but by creation: It would be as derogatory to the grace of God to be created by our own working, as to be saved by our own working: Therfore though Glorification be adding of a greater happinesse than we had by Creation, and so Creation is not enough thereto; yet on our part they have the same conditions. The reasoning after the Principles of true Protestants would not in its conclusion (though in its premises) seem altogether absurd. Because they affirm the absolute will and good pleasure of God, without any condition on mans part (in Mr. *Baxters* sense of Conditions) to be the alone cause both of his creating and saving us. But after Mr. *Baxters* Principles it would bee both absurd and odious; for so our good works must bee the condition of our Creation, because they are of our salvation, that we must be created by our sincere obedience because by it we are saved, and that our sincere obedience must go before our Creation, because they so do before our salvation, and

(when we have perseveringly obeyed without a being) we shall enough bee created and have a being. They that are taken with such Arguments, I doubt are in the number of them that *are made to be taken*, 2 Pet. 2. 12. And who can hold that which will away?

Mr. *Baxter* saw the wall gaping and ready to fall before hee had finished it, therfore hastens to plaister and dawb it, thus.

B. *Yet heer I say still* [*our full Justification*] *because as I have shewed* [i. e. *said*] *our first possession of it is upon our meer Faith, or contract with Christ. But I think our glorification will be acknowledged to have the same conditions with our finall justification at the bar of Christ: and why not to our entire continued justification upon earth?*

These are but words comparing that which is reall, with that which is but imaginary. We still deny such a full and finall justification at the bar of Christ compleating that which was but unperfect, conditionall and reversible heer upon earth. All that hee hath said to prove it hath been examined and found insufficient. We look for proof indeed, and meet with nothing but words. They that are once possessed of it by faith, are fully and finally possessed of it.

His peremptory and bold conclusion is now come (even upon his own grounds) to [I think;] and why had hee not kept his thoughts to himself untill he had known reason enough for rationall men to have concluded with him: yet upon this thought he addeth, and why not to our entire continued justification upon earth? To which we need say no more in answer but this, because wee must not build any Article of our Faith upon the thoughts of men, but upon the word of God.

To the objection which hee supposeth some may make, and to which he answereth before it be made against him, I say no more, but let him answer our reall not imagined objections; and such we shall so long defend untill by the light of the word wee finde them unworthy of defence. The Scripture which hee brings to prove the perseverance of Faith to be the condition of our persevering justification runs thus, Heb. 3. 14. *We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast to the end.* Here perseverance is made a declaration and evidence of the truth of our Faith, and of our participation of or Communion with Christ at present, not a condition either of our justification or the perseverance therof. By this it shall be evidenced that ye are truly in Christ, and justified by him, if ye persevere, for those that fall away were but seemingly, ne-

ver truly in Christ. They that are his in truth, continue so to the end. Like that v 6. *We are the house of Christ, if we hold fast our confidence to the end,* compared with 1 Jo. 2. 19. *They went out from us, but they were not of us, for if they had been of us, they would without doubt have continued with us; but they went out that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.* So the perseverance; or not persevering of these would manifest who had been, & who had not been truly partakers of Christ, and the house of his habitation, not the condition of their persevering justification, for then should it be for a time at least the condition of the perseverance of their justification who were never truly partakers of Christ, and consequently in Mr. *Brs.* phrase, had never a beginning of justification.

Hitherto of what Mr. *Baxter* hath said to confirme the Proposition. Hence he descendeth to prove the Assumption, *That Obedience is an undoubted condition of our salvation.* That wee may not here beat the winde, we do first understand his obedience to be the obedience of good workes, else is it the same with Faith, as I have shewed, and that of Faith in Scripture sense, and not in Mr. *Baxters* large unscripturall, and uncircumscriptive definition. So much also many of the Scripture testimonies which hee alleadgeth here & elswhere (which I shal reduce to this place) declare. Yea himself in many places before hath set to his hand that it is his meaning.

2. We understand him here by Salvation to mean that which he a little before calls glorification, and not simply the salvation which is one and the same with Iustification.

But 3. We except against him, that whereas without ceasing he beats our eares even into deafnesse with that Roman, Rampant, Exotick word [CONDITION,] scarce uttering a sentence which he doth not blesse or curse with it: though hee know the holy Scripture hath upon this Argument not the least mention of it, that wee might thence learn; that it is but borrowed from the Papists, and improved much by the Arminians, with whose common language through his familiarity with both parties, hee is more acquainted than we can be who have no traffique with them: yet he will not fully make knowne to us the meaning of the word, whether the signification thereof be boundlesse, or within what limits it is bounded? whether it comprehends under it all the necessary Antecedents of glorification, or no? if so. whether it comprehends not under it as well much disobedience as obedience, and works of the Divel as of God, as the *Causa sine quibus non,* we shall obtaine salvation by Christ?

Christ? Or whether by Conditions we must understand onely Duties? and if so, whether those alone which go before, or else also those that accompany and follow Justification and glorification? And withall, whether those duties as morall or as spirituall? because his Divinity being most drawne from naturall Philosophers and Theologers, mounts not above Morality, tels us nothing of spirituall things that the Gospel wholly treats of, shuns the very word [Spirituall] as a rock on which all the pride of man might suffer shipwrack, and the grace of God in Christ be alone exalted. Besides how far these conditions are to be stretched, whether only so far as that only their absence doth hinder, but their presence doth not put or inferr justification and salvation as the effects, (in which sence wee are wont to take the *Causa sine qua non*,) or else so far that both their absence doth hinder, and their performance produce these effects? In these and many other things whereof I shall be forced to speake in its proper place, Mr. *Baxter* will not impart his meaning to us, that he may take his liberty to traverse his ground, and under the name of Condition, ascend and descend, run sometimes in a wheele, and sometimes in a race, play all in sight, and least in sight, at his pleasure, reserving still to himselfe this advantage, to help himself with his Conditions, widening and straitening them, making them the same with, or more than his *Causa sine qua non*, (having kept the power in his own hand) as it shall be most inservient to his ends. In the meane while wee are permitted onely to heare the humming and bombing, but not to see the buz, whether it be a Hornet or a Beetle.

What hee will not himselfe directly tell us, wee must therefore take leave to gather from his writing as well as we can. In his Explication of this Thesis, even in that part thereof which I have before transcribed, being to prove that justification and salvation have the same Condition, hee tells us oft that we are both justified and saved by works. Here to follow his owne exposition, he teacheth, pa. 300 that the word [*By*] implieth more than an idle (presence and) concomitancy, if they only stand by while the work is in doing, it could not bee said, we are justified by works. That it speaks our works to have their agency and operation *in procurement, & in that kind of causality which they have.* And this is the same which under the 17. 18. and 19. Theses he had before delivered, of a twofold Righteousnes, Christs Righteousnes, and our Righteousnes, ours as absolutely necessary as his to salvation, both [in

their kind] effectually procuring it. So in that which follow
the explication, where, *to be the condition of our salvation*,
have a hand in, *or give right to justification*, are put by him
same thing, or as equipollent phrases. So that under the word
dition, he involves all the *Papists efficiency*, and as much as (
their and his defining and modifying of Merits) is comprehended
their doctrine of Merits.

In this sense therefore we deny Works or Obedience to be
dition of salvation. 1. Because thousands are saved without
viz. all that have been or shalbe saved being never in a capacity
work. 2. Because the New Covenant in promising salvation
it to follow grace and faith, not works, yea grace and faith in
sition to works, as hath been before shewed, cap. 15. of
tion and salvation together. And that not by the vertue of
dung and rags and filth of mans righteousness, wherwith Mr.
leth the belly of his faith in the largest sense, Thes. 70. but by
vertue of Christ *its object which it receiveth*, Jo. 1. 12. *and of the*
abundance of the grace and righteousness which it receiveth from Christ
in receiving him, Ro. 5. 19. 3. Because it is by inheritance,
our union unto Christ wee are made and adopted to bee with
children and joint heirs, Act. 26. 18. Ro. 8. 16. 17. Gal. 3. 18. E
1. 11. 14. Gal. 3. 29. and 4. 30. 31. Tit. 3. 7. and elsewhere,
that of Grace freely, therfore without works. For then should
be of debt, and no more of Grace, Ro. 4. 4. and 11. 6. 4. Becaus
it be at all by works then wholly by works, Christ is excluded,
not profit, will be all or nothing, do all, without works, and
no place or partnership to works with him in the business of
tion, if we bring any thing of works to save us, hee leaves us
to our works to save or damn us. *If ye be circumcised, Christ*
not profit you, ye are debtors to the whole Law, *i. e.* If ye bring
in part to save you, yee must trust wholly to works to save
Christ is become of none effect to you, Gal. 5. 2. 3. 4. 5. Neither
can they bee a condition in that way of causality to which Mr.
professes himself to tie it, *viz.* as the *Causa sine qua non*. For 1.
property of that kind of causality or conditionality not extended
beyond it self, can only by its absence, deny the effect (as in
case the want of obedience and good works can onely deny
which refuse or neglect them, to be saved or have right to
on) but by its presence cannot *Ponere* (as the say) *i. e.* conclude
or evince the effect, that he which doth them shall live in them or
save

ved by them, no nor yet that they shall be saved. For if they can, is by some other, and not by this kinde of causality which Mr. *Baxter* attributes to them. 2. Neither doth it (as himselfe describes operation in its causality to salvation) remove the impediments salvation which are in generall sinne, in particular chiefly unbelefe. If good workes can remove these it may save. But it can either remove the guilt of that which is past by way of purging it satisfying for it; neither is it made instrumentall to put us into e possession of Christs satisfaction and purging, for it precedes not follows it (whatsoever Mr. *Bax.* hath sayd to the contrary.) Nor it stop the flux of sin and unbeleefe, but that it breaks out upon ery of our good works to make them in themselves evil and damble, and doth no further or otherwise remove, than by denying nbeliefe so far as we doe beleeve, and the neglect of duties as far as we have diligence and zeal to perform them. But this cannot bee alled rightly the removing of the hindrances of our salvation: therre it cannot be the *Causa sine quanon* of our salvation. 6. Because lvation is the gift of Gods free grace, Ro. 6. 23. Jo. 10. 28. 2. Ti. 8. But it is a payment of justice and not a gift of Grace, which is ade the wages of works. *Didst thou not agree with me for a peny? ke what thine is* [by contract and condition of the bargain] *and ay way*; Mat. 20. 13. 14. Wheras contrariwise the free gift hath o other foundation or condition but Gods free love and good plea-re. *He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy*, Ro. 9. 15. So that *is not of him that willeth, or of him that runneth, but of God that weth mercy*, verse 16. Many other Arguments have our Divines gainst the Papists about this question, which I intreat the Reader nferch from them for his fuller satisfaction. Now let us see what Mr. *Baxter* brings to prove, that obedience and good workes are the condition of our salvation.

Yet by the way let us note, that the Argument it selfe which here e seeks to confirme, is the Papists, and great is *Bellarmines* striving to maintaine it as his great prop of justification and salvation by works. *Si promissio vitæ æternæ est conditionata*, (saith he) *ut Cap. 1. jubavimus, certè necessarium est implere conditionem, si quis salvus fieri velit*, i. e. if the promise of eternall life be conditionall, as I have proved in the first Chapter, certainly he must necessarily fulfil the condition that willbee saved. This Condition of which hee speakes is the same with Mr. *Baxters*, *viz.* the Condition of Works. Bell. de justif. lib. 4. cap 7.

Neither

Neither shall it be impertinent heer to take into consideration some rules of our Divines for the right understanding of the minde of the holy Ghost in promising eternall life, unto persons of such and such qualifications, or that perform such and such duties, before wee descend to examine the particular promises and testimonies which Mr. *Bx.* alleadgeth. These are principally such as follow.

1. That they belong (so farre as to bee effectuallized) to none else but such as are vitally within the covenant of Grace, under the protection of the bloud of the Lamb, in spirituall union with Christ Jesus the mediator of the new Covenant according to that of the Apostle: *All the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen,* [never effectuallized to them that are not in him] 2 Co. 1. 20. *To Abraham and his seed were the promises made, he saith not his seeds as of many, but of one, and to thy seed which was Christ.* viz. in him alone, and to them alone to be confirmed which are in Christ. Gal 3. 16. Therfore the blessednes which Matthew in sound of words seems to hold forth more generally, Ma. 5. 3. &c. Luke as the Expositor of him, or rather of the mind of Christ in those promises, contracts to the right objects or persons to whom they were to bee made good, thus *Jesus lifted his eyes upon his disciples and said, Blessed be* [YEE] *poor, for yours is the Kingdome of God. Blessed are YEE that hunger, YEE that weep &c.* implying that the blessednes was to come upon them, not by the vertue of these Acts and qualifications mentioned, but upon this ground alone that they were his Disciples, by him Gospellized and received into Covenant, this is that which *Augustine* so much presseth in such promises to looke to the Root which is Christ, and that the reward is not from their works, because they are holy, but because they are holy or Saints which wrought them, and that they are thence saints from whence righteous, not from the works but from the Faith of the workers.

2. That in such promises the qualificataions or works of the persons to whom they are directed are mentioned not as the ground or foundation of the blessednesse promised, but to shew the method and order which God observes in bringing them to the possession therof. Because he is holy, pure, spirituall, therfore he powrs into them his purifying, sanctifying, and adopting spirit to conform them to his own will and nature, before hee brings them into the full and reall fruition of himself. So hee promiseth all the heaven of felicities to the meek, the righteous, the saints, to them that love him, that fear him, that obey him; not therby insinuating that hee found

found them, but that he hath made, or will make them such, as may as he will crown at last with glory. Heerin the power of that Father of Spirits exceelleth and exceedeth the power of the fathers of our bodies. He new creates their hearts new forms their wills, puts into them a new spirit, therby making them as Peter saith, *partakers of the Divine Nature*, and to enjoy the kingdome of God within them heer, before they be translated to it above.

3. Nevertheless the foundation of all these promises is not such acts and qualifications in us, but the relation of sons, in which wee stand before God. Such God beheld us in Christ before wee were born, such hee hath made us that truly beleeve by the grace of the new Covenant, *having begotten us to himself of incorruptible seed*, 1. Pet. 1. 23. *we are born of God, and have received the spirit of adoption by which we cry Abba, Father*: So that our salvation dependeth not upon the vertues and good works which are mentioned in the promises, but upon this our relation of sons: *if sons then heirs, &c.* Rom. 8. 15. as a speciall friend of Mr. *Br.* who walks by the same rule and the same spirit with him hath acknowledged, heerin consenting with our Divines and stoutly maintayning their Assertion, at least because it seemed to give some fulture to his cause. And I suppose Mr. *Br.* will not heer leave him whom in all the rest he followeth.

4. Yet what the Lord giveth to and hath prepared of endlesse glory for his children as his children, he doth oft-times hold forth and promise to them as a reward of such gifts of grace in them, and of works which they have done, or sufferings that they have undergone for his sake. Not but that it was provided for them and promised to them, before all such works and sufferings as they were children: but for some other honourable ends, which I shall in part mention, having first instanced some promises of this kind. Before the birth of Isaac long, had the Lord of free grace promised to Abraham all blessednes corporall and spirituall, present and future, *that his seed should be as the dust of the earth, as the stars of heaven numberless, that he should bee blessed, and in him all nations of the earth be blessed: that the land of Canaan the type and the eternall land of Promise the Antitype* should be his and his seeds for ever. Ge. 12 2. 3. and 13. 15. 16. and 15. 1--6. and 17. 1--8. Yet afterward chap. 22. when Abraham had shewed that notable fruit of his faith, fear, and love to God, in offering his son Isaac in obedience to Gods command, God called from heaven to him by an Angel, and sayd, *By myself have I sworn, because thou hast done this thing, and hast not*

with held thy son, thy only son, That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars in heaven, and as the sand &c. and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice, Ge. 22. 15. 18. We see heer that promised as a reward of this act of obedience of Abraham, which God had by promise made sure to him before ever hee offered his son, or had the son to offer. To this I might annex the harmony of Scriptures, that testifying the kingdome of glory *to be prepared* for them that shall enjoy it, *from the beginning of the world; purchased for them by Christs death* Mat. 25. 34. Heb. 9. 15. *That they were begotten to it by the seed of God begetting Christ in them,* 1. Pet. 1. 3. 4. *and are inrighted to it by their adoption:* yet notwithstanding God cals it the *Reward of the inheritance,* and promiseth it to them for their works and faithfull service in the Lord: Not implying therby that the workes done put them into a worthiness or capacity to receive it, (For if a thousand times more were done and suffered by them that are not in Christ, that are not adopted Children it should be nothing to salvation) but for other very glorious and spirituall ends, among which may be numbred these that follow.

1. To declare the operation of the Spirit of Adoption upon the Saints, that having the promise made, and the hope of this eternall inheritance begotten in them freely by Grace in Christ, and the same witnessed and assured to them of meere mercy; it doth not permit them *to turn the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ into lasciviousness,* but stir & encourage them to all doings & sufferings for Christ by the intuition of the reward: having their eyes fixed upon the reward before them, they are animated by it to do all things, *knowing that their labour is not vaine in the Lord; to all sufferings,* concluding, *that all are not worthy to be compared to the glory to be revealed to them;* to rejoyce in all, having an eye to the recompence of the reward. And so all their obedience is in a way of love and thankfulnesse for the right which is freely given them to the Kingdome, not thereby to inright themselves to it.

2. To declare Gods acceptance as well of the works as the persons of his adopted ones, and thereby to hearten them to well doing when in every act and service of love which they perform, in every suffering that they beare for his sake, he still as it were meets them not only with *his apples and flaggons,* but also with his Crown and Kingdome, for this and for that service renewing still the promise of it: This sets an edge upon their Love, and sublimates their Spirits to

more

more and greater undertakings. What? doth my Heavenly Father take notice of and accept so graciously these weak services, renew the Covenant and as it were bring down Heaven and himselfe into mee, upon such slender performances, so that I walke and work, and do and suffer not onely in the hope, but even in the view and possession of blessednes! what is there so high or low, great or small, to which I should not stretch or stoop to please so good a Father? shall I receive so great a salvation so frequently set afresh before mine eye, and new ratified to me; without doing or rendring any thing for it?

3. To manifest to the evill world that God in the midst of the riches of his grace is also infinitely righteous, a Lover and Rewarder of purity, piety, holinesse, righteousnes, and all the works thereof. For to these his promises of life are extended, and into these hee leadeth his children, *new creating them to the performance thereof, having ordained them to walke therein.* So that hereby the mouth of the enemies of Christ, and blasphemers are stopped *from crying out against the inequality of Gods wayes*, or charging Christ to be *unjustly a friend of Publicans and sinners.* Seeing that although hee loves them even while they are such, and pittieth them because they are such, yet he loves them not as such, much lesse glorifieth them as such: But first purgeth them with his owne bloud, and sanctifies them by his owne Spirit, and leads them forth in his owne strength into all obedience both of doing and suffering, encouraging them by his precious promises in all the way of their Pilgrimage, and telling them that no least portion of all their labours or patience in the Lord shall passe unregarded or unrewarded; and in the end of all their journey crownes them and their obedience with the eternall glory promised. Yet so as that all the glory which was promised to them in that which some of the Fathers and the Schoolmen call the *Via*, the Way, and that is actually conferred upon them *in Patriâ*, in the Countrey, in Heaven, was theirs by grace in Christ, before the foundation of the World was laid, much more before they did either good or evill; and theirs in themselves and to their own apprehensiblenes if not apprehension, at their first union unto Christ, and adoption into Gods Family through Christ: so that if we look to the foundation therof in God, it is his free Grace and Love unto us in Christ, or in our selves it is our union unto Christ, and relation of Sonship towards God in Christ. Yet so as usually works intervene, and the promises of God

both to the works and workers, as for many other, so for the reasons and ends heer expressed, oft renewed

Now let us attend Mr. *Br.* to hear from him what Scriptures or reasons he brings to prove his Assumption.

B. Heb. 5: 9. *Christ is the Author of eternall salvation to them that obey him.*

This Scripture makes against him not for him. 1. If Christ bee the authour, then is not our obedience the ground of it, but wee should be authors therof to our selves, at least hee should bee in part author of it by his, and we in part by our obedience, and so the honour therof should be parted between Christ and our selves. But this Mr. *Br.* would have to bee set up as his doctrine. 2. Therfore when he is sayd to be such to them that obey him, it is the same as if it were sayd, to them that hurling away as dung their own righteousnes, do beleeve in, and receive him alone to salvation. For so to obey Christ, to obey the Gospel, and that which Christ calleth the hearing and keeping of *My* word, *My* commandements, *My* sayings, [in so many places as that it is hard to number them] are equipollent terms, and hold forth the obedience to the doctrine of faith, in oppositon to the obedience which the Law or old Covenant prescribeth to salvation, a seeking of salvation by the righteousnes of Christ, and no more by our own righteousnes. 3. If it were otherwise, yet the persons that shall bee saved by Christ are heer described only, and not a condition by which they are to be saved, prescribed.

B. Ro. 2. 7. 8. 9. 10.

He alleadgeth not the words, and may bee ashamed to quote the place to prove the salvation which is by the Gospel, to follow the tenour of works; knowing that the Apostle there goeth about to convince the Jews that the Law cannot save them, by shewing upon what terms salvation runneth under the Legall or old Covenant.

B. Rev. 22 14. *Blessed are they that doe his commandements, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the City.*

The doing of Christs commandements heer, is the same which Heb. 5. 9. is called the obeying of Christ, and the meaning of both is there explained. Faith which Christs commandement calls for, gives right to the tree of life, and to all the priviledges of the new Jerusalem.

B. Jn. 1. 22. 23. 24. 25.

What

What he would infer from the three former of these verses, hee saith not, and I dream not. Any other three verses in the whole Bible might have been quoted as pertinent to his purpose as these, as far as my dull brain can comprehend. To the 25. if by the Law of Liberty he understands the Law of the Old Covenant, or of the Decalogue, and by blessed everlasting salvation, (as he erewhile termed it) then hee prescribes salvation hence to bee sought by the Law, and not by Christ, by the covenant of works, not of grace, and so the salvation of man shall stand or fall upon these terms, as hee doth or doth not forget to doe all that is commanded in the Law: and Christ must not be at all looked after, heer is no mention at all of him: and thus to argue is worse than Popish, even Jewish. But if he understand by the Law of Liberty the Gospel, then hath it the same sense with the former Scriptures, teacheth us to seek salvation in a Gospel way, as a free gift from free grace as children of liberty whom the son hath made free, and not as children of bondage by works. He that doth thus shall be blessed in this his deed. Some of our Expositors I know expound it another way, yet not with, but against Mr. *Baxter.* B. Ma. 5. 1. to the 13.

To this enough hath been sayd a little before in this Chapter.

B. Especially Mat. 5. 19. 20.

The former verse runs thus: *Whosoever therfore shal break one of the least of these Cõmandments and teach men so to do, the same shalbe least in the Kingdom of Heaven: But whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shalbe great in the Kingdom of Heaven.* Christ here speaketh of Teachers under the Gospel. And the sense (as may be gathered from the precedent verses) is this: Whosoever under a pretence of the liberty of the Gospel, shall take to himselfe, or instill into others a licentiousnesse, to break the Commandements of the Law, or to neglect any of that holiness and righteousness which is the matter of the Law, that man shalbe an instrument of little, yea of no use in the Gospel Church: But whosoever shal so learn and teach Christ as in and through him, to take into his owne and presse upon others mens affections, and practise all the duties of holiness and righteousnesse which the Law requireth, in a Gospel way, this man shall be an instrument of great good in the Gospel Church, as one that hath learned, and teacheth Christ to salvation and to sanctification also. If this in its substance be not the meaning of this Scripture, I know not the meaning of any one Text of Scripture.

The latter which is the 20. verse is read in these words: *Except your*

your Righteousnesse exceed the righteousnesse of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdome of Heaven. True. Theirs was their owne Righteousnesse, the Righteousnesse of works which could never satisfie for or expiate their unrighteousnesse. Except we trample this as dung (in respect of confidence in it) to put on Christ for righteousnesse, who hath both satisfied and expiated, we shall never enter into the spirituall Priviledges of the Kingdome of Grace, much lesse into the joyes of the Kingdome of glory. What is there in either of these verses to promote Mr. *Baxters* salvation by Works?

B. Mat. 7. 13. *Enter ye in at the strait gate, for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in therat. But strait is the gate and narrow the way that leadeth to life and few there be that find it.*

And will Mr. *Br.* take up the broad and vulgar way of expounding this broad and that narrow gate and way? That by the broad way and wide gate, are to be understood the way of prophanenesse, Atheisme, Lust, Luxury, Carnall security, &c. and by the strait Gate and narrow way, strictnesse of life and conversation? unless he ride in this common Rode, there is nothing to be found that will square with his purpose. But that this interpretation is wide from the scope of Christ, will appeare 1. by comparing *Luke* with *Matthew*; who *Luke* 13 24 thus renders the words of Christ, *Strive to enter in at the strait Gate, for many shall seeke to enter in, and shall not bee able.* Whence it appeares that both these Gates and Wayes are such as men seek to enter into life by. And was there ever that man so mad, so void of the naturall light of reason and conscience that did strive to enter into life by Prophanenesse, Lust, Atheisme and impure living? Doth not the Apostle tell us, that the most stupified among the Heathen *do so far know the judgement of God, as to know these things to be worthy of death?* Rom. 1. vers. ult. Where it is said of the *narrow way and gate*, *few there be that finde it*, if it should be understood of the strictnesse of Morall holinesse and righteousnesse, it might well be said, *few there are that enter by it*; but to say, *few there be that finde it*, is not agreeable to reason. For who is there that findes it not? The very Light of nature teacheth all men this naturall way to life by the strictnes and perfection of their naturall and morall righteousnesse. And this is the greatest beam in their eye blinding them that they cannot see the straight and effectuall way indeed.

What

What then is the strait gate and narrow way to life, wherof Christ heer speaketh? Let Christ himselfe interpret himself; *I am the way I am the door, by me if any man enter, none can come to the Father but by me*, Jo. 10. 9. and 14. 6. *The way into the holiest*, i. e. into heaven *consecrated or new made for us through the vail of Christs flesh*, saith the Apostle, Heb. 10. 19. 20. or let Mr. *Br* shew that the Gospel owneth any other way to life. This is the way that few find, when Peter had seen and spoken but of a glimpse and glance of it. *Blessed art thou Simon Bar-jona*, saith our Saviour, *for flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father which is in heaven*, Ma. 16. *None can enter into it except the Father draw him*, Jo. 6. 44. *Except he be taught and have learned of the Father*, ver. 45. And great striving must there be against our own wisedome, before we can be brought to leave the way that nature hath taught to find and enter into this way which the Father revealeth. What then (say yee) is the broad way and wide gate by which men seek to enter into life? I answer M. *Brs.* way, the way of our own righteousnes and strict carriage. It is broad and wide because all learn it from nature corrupted, which tells us it was the way if we had kept it, but cannot tell us that it is now blocked up to sinners, so that many, so many seek for life by their own righteousnes and works, doe by this supposed way of life passe to destruction. Not but that the way of vice is a broad way also, but our Saviour speaks not heer of it, but of the broad way by which men seek life but find destruction. To this effect is that of our Saviour, *The Publicans and harlots enter into the kingdome of heaven before the strict-living Pharisees*. Ma. 21. 31 By what way did these vitious livers enter but by Christ into the Kingdom? else *if strictness of life had been the way to it, the Pharisees had entred before them.* This is the interpretation of this Gospel text after the tenour of the Gospel, and so Mr. *Br. suo se jugulavit gladio*, hath brought a sword to cut the throat of his own cause.

B. Ma. 7. 21. *Not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter &c. but he that doth the will of my Father, &c.*

This is the *will and work of the Fathers willing and commanding* [us to life] *that we beleeve on him whom he hath sent*, Jo. 6. 29.

B. Ma. 7. 22. 23. *Many shall say in that day, Lord we have prophesied, &c. to whom it shall be answered, I know you not, depart from me, ye workers of iniquities.*

Hypocrites that come with their mouths full of Works and merits to plead for Heaven shall all be shaken off, and the ground of their

their exclusion is this, *I know you not*, ye were not built upon mee, had no union with mee, no setled dwelling and recumbency upon me, therfore he shakes off both them and their works, as workers and works of iniquity.

B. Ro. 8. 4. *That the righteousnes of the Law might be fulfilled in us which walk not after the flesh but after the spirit.*

The righteousnes of the Law is perfect. *And they walk not after the flesh but after the spirit, which* (as the same Apostle saith) *worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh, i. e.* (as in the following verses he expoundeth) in legall *priviledges*, or *works of their own Righteousnes*, Phi. 3. 3. In these the righteousnes of the Law is fulfilled. They have a perfect righteousnes even Christ made Righteousnes to them *which the Law weak through the flesh* could not produce in them.

B. Ro. 8. 13. *If yee live after the flesh yee shall die: but if yee through the spirit do mortifie the deeds of the body yee shall live.*

Who they are chiefly that in reference to life and death, doe live after the flesh, and after the spirit, the same Apostle teacheth not only in the forequoted Text, Phi. 3. 3. but also Gal. 3 3. *Are yee so foolish? having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?* In which words I challenge Mr. *Baxter*, yea the whole pack of Jesuits, if they dare to deny that by beginning in the spirit the Apostle means their trusting wholly on Christ for justification and salvation, and by being made perfect by the flesh their seeking to perfect it by works; *viz.* Circumcision, and with it the morall duties which the Law commandeth. If in this place he will take the flesh and spirit in a larger sense, yet compare we this 13. with the 1. vers of the Chapter, and it will appear heer is nothing for his turn. Ver. 1. he saith, *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.* But who are they? Such as *walk not after the flesh but after the spirit.* Let now Mr. *Baxter* put what sense he will upon flesh and spirit in the 13. verse, it must bear the same sense as in the 1. verse. And then if any demand why they that live after the flesh must die? the answer is in readinesse, Because they are not in Christ Iesus: or why they that mortifie &c. by the spirit, shall live? Every one can answer, because they are in Christ Iesus. So that in these there is no condemnation, to the other nothing but condemnation. Because

1 Jo. 5. 2. *he that hath the son hath life, he that hath not the son hath not life.*

Heer according to promise I annex what I left unanswered *cap.* 16.

16. of the third bunch of Scriptures quoted by Mr. *Baxter*, p 236. referring them to this place to be examined as speaking more soundingly to glorification than to justification by works. I shall begin as I there left at

B. pa. 236. lin. 21. Mat. 10. 37. *He that loveth Father or Mother more then me is unworthy of me, so of Sonne or Daughter.*

When he meaneth the same with *Bellarmine* (as he hath enough manifested under his 26. Thesis) let him speak out the same with *Bellarmine*; *viz.* That none shall receive salvation by Christ, but those that by works merit it, and make themselves worthy of it. Let him so express himselfe and hee shall not want an expresse answer. At present while he will lurk in the dark, we will leave him in the dark.

B. Lu. 13. 24. hath been before examined. Phi. 2. 12. *Work out your salvation with fear and trembling.*

Whether we look to that which precedes, or that which followeth this Text, we shall find its testimony to be to Mr. *Baxters* cause, what a Colledge Brush, *alias* called a hatchet, to a Freshmans Gown, cutting it in peeces because it will not be cleansed. If to that which goeth before, we are bidden v. 5-11. to follow the example of Christ (as far as he was in a capacity to give him selfe a patterne to us in this kind) in selfe deniall, *who being in the forme of God, and equall with God, took to himselfe the forme of a servant, made himselfe of no reputation, abased himselfe to the death, to the Cross, to the Curse: and so became exalted on high above all names &c.* So must wee deny and abase our selves in our relation as Christ did himselfe in his, lay all the false glitter and glory of our works and righteousnes in the dust, as he did his true glory: watching with a holy feare and trembling over our backsliding heart that is apt assoon as any shew of righteousnes and goodnes appears in our selves and works, to depart from Christ, and to rest in it as our sanctuary: in this case is it that the Apostle requires this continuall working and heaving our selfe from our selves, that Christ may be our All. And that with much fear, and trembling watchfulnes over our deceitfull hearts, that are apt still to decline from his righteousnes, and to close with our own, if there bee not continuall working and warring against its fleshly working in this kind. If wee look to that which follows, all confidence in our own strength is prohibited, and all dependance and relying upon Gods grace and power is commanded, that wee

ſtand alway in a trembling feare of falling and ſinking through our miſerable weakneſſe and proneneſs to Apoſtacy, and therefore keep firme and continuall hold-faſt in the grace and power of God extended to us in Chriſt for our ſupportation; becauſe it is *God alone that worketh in us both to will and to do, of his good pleaſure*, and not of any worth or workes of ours moving him. ver. 13. Such a working out of our ſalvation, that conſiſteth in working away all our owne works, & righteouſnes, as inſufficient yea as deſtructive to it, and in working up our ſelves by the power of God into Chriſt; into the ſhelter of Gods grace for ſalvation, wee grant to Mr. *Baxter*. But this will not pleaſe him. Yet becauſe the Apoſtle (as by the context is evident) teacheth this and no other working for ſalvation here, we muſt leave him ſo diſpleaſed as they are wont to be that by their owne plea deſtroy theire owne cauſe, and miniſter matter out of their owne mouth to be judged.

B. Ro. 2. 7. 10. hath been before anſwered.

B. 1. Co. 9. 24. *So run that ye may obtaine.* & 2. Tim. 2. 5. *If a man ſtrive for maſteries, he is not crowned except he ſtrive lawfully.*

What this running & ſtriving [or fighting is] the ſame Apoſtle teacheth us by his example. 2. Tim. 4. 7. 8. I have fought the good fight (ſaith he) I have finiſhed my courſe: what meanes he by theſe? the next words declare, I have kept the Faith: henceforth &c.

B. 2. Tim. 2. 12. *If we ſuffer, we ſhall alſo reign* [*with him*] *If we deny him, he alſo will deny us.*

This is, if in deſpite of all ſufferings or perſecutions, wee ſtand faſt in the Faith, and adhere firme to Chriſt, we ſhall reign with him; But if for feare of perſecution we deny him and fall from the Faith he alſo will deny us, that ever wee had any true union and communion with him by faith.

B. 1. Tim. 6. 18. 19. *Charge them that are rich &c. not to truſt in uncertain riches &c. that they do good, be rich in good works, ready to diſtribute, willing to communicate, laying up for themſelves a good foundation againſt the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternall life.*

The Apoſtle heer forbids the rich to truſt in, or to make their uncertain riches a foundation of happines to themſelves, and contrariwiſe admoniſheth them that this traſhy felicity ſhould not hinder them from laying a good foundation of their everlaſting bliſſe in heaven.

heaven. He saith not (as Mr. *Br.* abusively wresteth his words, in his Append. p. 95.) that they should lay their good works as a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternall life. For so should he have contradicted himself, 1. Co. 3. 10 11. According to the grace of God given me, I have laid the foundation &c. For other foundation can no man lay, than that is layd, Jesus Christ. So this exhortation is the same in substance with that of our Saviour, Lay not up for your selvs treasure upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt &c. but lay up for your selves treasure in heaven where neither moth &c.

B. Lu. 11. 28. *Blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it.*

Amen, For the word of God makes Christ our All, and in us all, Col. 3. 11. *Search the Scriptures* (or the word of God) saith the same our Saviour, *for in them ye think to have eternall life, and they are they which testifie of me*, [not of works to have wrought out eternall life for you] *yet yee will not come to mee*, [but to works and your own righteousnes] *that ye may have life*, Io. 5. 39. 40.

B. Mat. 25. 41. 42. *Goe yee cursed into hell fire prepared for the Divell and his Angels: for I was hungry and yee fed me not, thirsty &c.*

Righteous judgement. For what other cause should the cursed be sentenced to the curse, but for their unbeleefe and evill deeds, which brought and deserved the curse? Would he have them to be damned for their faith and good works? The rest Scriptures have been urged and examined before.

Now of all these Scriptures, let Mr. *Br.* name but two that were not prepared to his hand, eyther by *Bellarmine*, or some other Papists in their disputes against the Protestants? or shew any reason, why he mentions most of them, having no shew of subserviency to his purpose, unless he thinks them hallowed by their fingering?

If there bee expected a larger and fuller Answer to the Arguments which the Papists draw from any of these Scriptures, I transmit to some of the many hundreds of our Divines that have answered them.

Chap. VIII.

Arg. *Mr.* **Baxters 7.** *Argument for Justification by works examined, drawne from the Tenour of the last dayes Judgement which he saith shall pass according to works. And these questions discussed, whether, upon whom, and in what respects the last sentence shall so passe according to works.*

A Seventh Argument which he brings to prove Justification by works is drawne from the issues upon which our future Judgement shall passe in the last day. That (saith he) shall be according to works: Therefore is this also. But let him bee heard speaking his owne words.

B. Thesis 80. pag. 317. *It is most clear in the Scripture, and beyond all dispute, that our Actuall, most proper, compleat Justification at the great Judgement will be according to our works, and according to what we have done in the Flesh, whether good or evill: which can bee no otherwise than as it was the Condition of that Justification. And so Christ at that great Assize will not give his bare will of Purpose as the Reason of his proceedings, but as he governed by a Law, so he will judge by a Law; and will then give the reason of his publicke sentence from mens* keeping or breaking of the conditions of his *Covenant, that so the mouths of all may be stopped, and the equity of his Judgement may be made manifest to all; and that he may there set forth his hatred to the sins, and not only to the persons of the condemned; and his love to the obedient, and not only to the persons of the justified.*

This also he hath from *Bellarmine* & the other Jesuits & *Papists.* Neither is there any one besides his fourth Argument which he hath not transcribed from them: and even that also is by them somewhat hammered to his use. Nay, from the very beginning to the end of this his Tractate all is theirs as to the matter thereof: onely the translating of it into English, and reducing it to his owne method and order he can call his; but the substance of all is theirs [as to Justification by works,] and from them in common with the Socinians and Arminians, [as to Justification by Faith, as an Act or Worke.]

Worke.] This I could easily make evident by affixing but marginall quotations of those Popish and Arminian Authours to this Worke, whom in every particle hee followeth, as having spoken the same things before him; if I had now that which once I had, that which might be called a Library. By how much the more I admire some that make their concourse & confluence to him from all parts as to an Oracle, to learne from him that which at home by their owne fire, *Erkius*, *Hosius*, *Vega*, *&c.* or the more ancient Schoolemen before them, or *Bellarmine* with the Jesuits and Arminians, since them, would have taught them more at large; or which besides other hundreds of our Divines, one *Chamier* in his 3 Tome of his *Panstratia*, would have given them to understand at large, together with a large and full confutation of all [as to the Papists:] Yet see with what confidence Mr. *Baxter* speaketh. *It is most clear and beyond all dispute*, &c. What is so cleare? *that our proper, compleat, and actuall justification*, &c. This is cleare by Scripture. Yet neither hath he alleadged or can alleadge any one Scripture that tels us of or teacheth any such justification. The Papists tell us indeed of a two-fold Justification, but both in this life. They say Christs judgement or sentence; or our account and reckoning, not our justification, shall thus pass in the last day. The Arminians indeed say as Mr *Baxter*; and hee hath learned to speake as confidently as they, proving as little as they. Now what boldnes is it to call that, from a pretended cleare testimony of Scripture, *our Actuall, most Proper, compleat Justification*, which the Scripture doth in no place call or bid us to call Justification in any sense or consideration? we would grant to Mr. *Baxter* the use of his owne Phrase and use it with him; if he would understand by the Justification in the day of Judgement, onely either the publication and open declaration of the justification before given and received; or the conferring on Believers the Glorious and eternall fruits above of their justification here; or their exemption from the sentence of vengeance which shalbe then pronounced, against & from condemnation, which shalbe then executed upon the unbelieving world: (in which sense it is sometimes indeed in Scripture called our Redemption, and the day of Redemption to the Saints, which to the world will be an evill day, a day of Judgement.) But this will not satisfie him, and the Scripture grants no more: so that we cannot please him without displeasing God.

Againe when he saith our *most Proper Justification* will be at the

great Judgement *according to our workes, and according to what we have done in the flesh, whether it be good or evill.* Doth he meane first that the measure of our justification wilbe according to the measure of our works. great works, and a great and full justification; a little Treasury of workes, and a little corner of justification? This agrees not with his owne phrase in tearming it a compleat justification. Nor will it cohere with the definition that he gives to the justification, Thes. 39. making it to consist in Gods *acquitting from the Accusation, and condemnation of the Law.* This Act of God or of Christ doth not *recipere magis & minus*, hee that hath more works cannot be said to bee more, or he that hath less to be less acquitted: but if at all acquitted, then compleatly acquitted; acquitting, and not acquitting being contradictories that admit of no *medium*, but the one or other must stand in all its force.

Or 2. doth he mean that the being or not being of justification doe follow the being or not being of our Works, no works and no justification, but if works then justification? will it not hence necessarily follow both that many which have died in Christ shall be condemned? *viz.* all that after their union to Christ by the Spirit, departed out of this life before they had time and oportunity to do such works as Mr. *Baxter* after instanceth and many that never believed in Christ, never were in Christ shall bee justified by Christ the last day *viz.* such as have lived and died such as the Apostle *Paul* was before his conversion: *touching the Righteousnesse which is by the Law blameless*, Phil. 3. 6. and that of sincerity in opposition to hypocrisie and vaine glory, walking in *all good Conscience before God*? As for faith in Christ hee doth not heere touch upon, nor whether any of his reasons which hee brings to confirme his Thesis will infer it, we shall see in examining them.

Acts 23. 1

3. When he saith that Christ at that great Assize will not give his bare will of Purpose as the reason of his proceedings, &c. Let him say whether his intent in this passage were not to cast an Odium upon the Protestants, as if they so taught? And except hee can produce any one man that hath so taught, and hath not still asserted that the damnation of the damned shall be for their sinnes, and the glorification of the glorified a free gift of God for the satisfaction which Christ hath made for them with reference to their being in Christ: Let him confesse that he hath slandered them.

4. In the rest that is contained in this Thesis we finde not hing but contradictions, his unsaying and gainsaying of what he had before said

ibid. A little before, pag. 294, 295. to destroy that interpretation of *St. James* which our Divines bring, that when he speakes of justification by workes, hee meanes the declaring to men by works the truth of their Faith and Justification; the man is angry and cries out, *An usurped Judgement and Justification. I affirme, The World is no lawfull Judge of our Righteousnesse before God; neither are they competent or capable Judges of our Righteousnesse or unrighteousnesse; neither are works a certaine* Medium *or evidence whereby the world can know us to be righteous, for the outward part an hypocrite may performe, and the inward part, Principles and ends of the worke they cannot discern.* Why was it that hee was so hot there against the possibility of manifesting to men the truth of our Righteousnes? It was against his Cause there to owne it. Here contrariwise, *Justification in the last day must passe by workes to declare to the World not only the righteousnes & obedience of the justified, but also the equity of the Justifier, and to stop every mouth from speaking against either.* And now the world is no longer an usurping, but a lawfull Judge, not an insufficient, but a competent and capable Judge, not onely of mans righteousnes, but of Christs equity in judgement, and works are become a certaine *Medium* and evidence to manifest both to the world. How comes this sudden change? heer it tends to the promoting of his cause to affirme it. And this alters the Case quoth *Ployden*. How rightly did Mr. *Baxter* describe his owne acting in this businesse, p. 291. *I resisted* (saith he) *the Light of this Conclusion as long as I was able.* It is the light of the Conclusion, not of the Premises that swayeth him. First hee pitcheth upon this Conclusion, *Works justifie*, there was light in this Conclusion, it fell out of the Lant-horne of the Jesuits sophistry into his bosome, and by that light he is swayed, and having taken up the conclusion in such light of its owne from them, now he digs downward for day, and takes up that which erewhile he shook off as darknes, for light to illustrate and prove it. So his light conclusion is first formed, and afterward he seeks for Crutches and reasons what come first to hand to support it, sacrificing here more to hast than to reason, lest his idol should fall before he returnes with his props to sustaine it. And what if upon new thoughts we shall finde all that is here said allso, unsaid again? Let us passe to his explication, peradventure we may stumble at such a stone before we come off from it.

2. Explication.

Heere I have these things to prove: 1 *that the Justifying sentence shall passe according to works as well as Faith:*
2. *That the Reason is, because they are parts of the condition.*
For the first see Mat. 25. 21. 23. *well done good and faithfull servant, thou hast been faithfull over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord. And most plaine is that from the mouth of the judge himselfe describing the order of the processe of that day* Mat. 25. 34. 35. *Come ye blessed inherit the Kingdome &c.* [*for I was hungry &c. So* 1. Pet 1. 17. *who without respect of persons judgeth according to every mans works.* So 2. Co 5. 10. *We must all appeare before the judgement seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done whether good or bad.* So Rev. 20. 12. 13. *They were judged every man according to his works,* Heb. 13. 17. Phil 4. 17. Mat. 12. 36 *&c. but this is evident already.*

The Scriptures that he brings to prove that the justifying sentence shall passe according to workes, as well as Faith are first here put and therefore first to be examined. And against his reasoning from them I except. 1. [as well as Faith] is here foysted in being wanting in the position. And why heere supplyed, but to beguile the simple with a good opinion of his assertion as if he attributed something to Faith also in Christs and Pauls sense. When contrariwise he teacheth that Faith hath nothing to doe in this businesse, but in the notion of our Act, our righteousnesse or worke, so that with him to be justified by Faith is to be justified by our owne worke.
2. That there is no one of these Scriptures but is alledged by *Bellarmin* and his fellows against the Protestants, and by them fully answered & manifested to make nothing for justification or salvation by works, scripture after scripture, no one of them pretermitted. When Mr. *Baxter* now stands up in *Bellarmins* place against us, is it sufficient for him to tel us what *Bellarmin* hath said against the truth (as if we could not without him know it) and to leave unanswered yea unmentioned the hundreds of our side that have retorted upon him his owne arguments to the subverting of his owne cause, that by these Scriptures he would have maintained? If he would have

have another answer; ought he not to have excepted against the validety of those that have beene already given? Is he worthy to heare more from vs that hath stopped his eares against all that so many worthies have said already, scorning to take notice thereof? Nay when he will onely alledge the Scriptures, and not take the labour to tel us what or how he will conclude from them he leaves us not in a capacity to declare so much as our consent with him or dissent from him. Yet for the use of the weaker sort of readers that have not ability to make recourse to those learned workes where these controversies are handled, or to understand them in that language in which most of them are written; I shal speak something in generall to all these Scriptures.

First of that of Mat. 25. 21. 23. or rather taking the whole parable together, beginning at ver. 14. and ending at v. 30. granting it on both sides to be the same Parable which *Luke* recordeth chap. 19. beginning at the 12. and ending at the 27. verse, (which very few have questioned, no one hath had cause to deny) then it suits not at all with Mr. *Baxters* purpose, or his Judgement dayes justification. For the Kingdome of Heaven, and the Lords comming and reckoning with his Servants, and retribution of their service is to be taken for Christs comming to preach first in his owne person, and then to set up and stablish the Gospel by the Ministry of his Apostles. The servants to be reckoned with are principally the Teachers of the Iewes; the Talents used, or abused, are the mysteries of the Gospel revealed, though veyled under the Law. The matter of the Account is what each by his serious studies and labours had cleared up to himselfe and others of this Gospel and saving knowledge of Christ before his comming for the advancement and advantage of Christ at his comming. They which had spent their labours this way, received at Christs comming a double measure of the spirit of illumination in the knowledge of Christ and salvation by him, and were intrusted with a fuller measure of this sacred Treasure to bee the dispencers thereof to the world. But hee which had wrapt his Talent in a Napkin and hid it in the earth, left the Doctrine of Christ (scattered throughout the old Testament) under a veile as he found it, without searching into it, and clearing it up to others; was left in the state of infidelity, rejected, and bound over hand and foot by his unbelefe to perdition. And his *Citizens which sent Word after him, we will not have this man to rule over us*, we will have a Christ, such a one as wee have framed

to our selves in our owne immaginations, but not this Christ; have their doom not only denounced, but executed also upon them, *bring them hither and slay them before me.* Who are these but the great Body and Nation of the Iewes, that professed themselves Citizens and the onely Saints of God, but for their refusall of Christ, were slaine and destroyed by the sword of the Romans? And so the parable comprehends in it a Prophecy of the successe of the Kingdome of Grace, now in the way of erecting in its power; as to the Iews: So saith *Luke* in that 19. Chapter, verse 11. *Hee added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem*, and because they thought *that the Kingdome of God should immediatly appeare*; by this Parable foretelling them that the Citizens, the Children of the Kingdom, the Iews for their rejection of Christ should bee *cast out into utter darknesse, where is weeping and gnashing of teeth*: i. e. into blindnesse of minde and stubbornesse of heart, accompanied with all calamity and misery, as we see them undergoing untill this day. This I acknowledge to be but my owne private opinion, yet such as I could easily manifest from the Text it selfe (if occasion were) to be very probable, if not certainely the minde of Christ. Yet let it stand or fall, *sub calculo melioris Iudicii.*

But if we are to understand all of Christs last Comming to judgement, it ministers nothing to advantage Mr. *Baxters* Cause, but enough to ruinate it: For first the faithfull Servants that shall bee so richly rewarded, are such as wrought with a free spirit, and the reward which they received was a free gift, they challenged it not in St. Conditions name, and Christ confers it freely as their munificent Lord. That hee mentions their service argues not either dignity or desert in their service, but the riches of his grace that having justified their persons, hee had in regard their service also. The unprofitable servant cast into utter darknesse, is Mr. *Baxters* legall man, serving with a mercenary and slavish spirit, expects nothing from Christ but in the way of justice, lookes upon him as upon *an austere man, a strait Law-giver, and a rigorous exactor of the fulfilling of his Lawes*; *I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sowne, and gathering where thou hast not strawed, and I was afraid*, (saith he) and so did nothing because of his feare of so strict a Lord, at least nothing to purpose, nothing to the advancing of the *Kingdome of Christ in righteousnesse, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost* within himselfe or others.

The second Scripture, Mat. 25. 34. 35. is most plain (saith Mr. *Baxter*)

Baxter) in which the mouth of the Judge himselfe describeth the order of the processe of that day; *Come ye blessed inherit &c. For I was hungry &c.* The Judges mouth describes, but why doth Mr. *Baxters* mouth refuse to speak out the description which the Judge maketh of the processe of that day? If hee began at ver. 31. *when Christ is set in his throne to call all Nations before him, to judgement, he declares the maner of the processe, 1. by separating the sheep from the goats, 2. by setting the sheep at his right hand.* What the sheep were himself declares, Jo. 10. such as *hear his voice, his Gospel voice* and are Gospellized and spirituallized by it. What hee means by his right hand, the Apostle declares, 1. Thess 4 16 17. *The dead in Christ shall rise first, and shall bee caught up in the clouds to meet with the Lord in the ayre:* What to do? not only *to be with the Lord, but also,* as the same Apostle sayth, *to sit with him in judgement, and to judge the world,* 1. Co. 6. 2. This is the right hand of Christ, to which the saints perhaps shall bee advanced, even before the dead out of Christ shall be raysed. To this at last is annexed what Mr. *Br.* alleadgeth, *Come yee blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdome prepared for you from the beginning of the world* Who seeth not heer the grounds of their glorification to bee, that they were Christs sheep? the heirs of God, and his elect vessels? That they are to be convened before Christ, not as prisoners to bee judged, but to bee owned as his justified ones, and to receive the glorious fruits of their justification and adoption, a Kingdome by inheritance; yea to sit as partners and Commissioners with Christ in judging the world? what the Lord Iesus addeth, for I was hungry &c. and yee thus and thus ministred unto me; will Mr. *Baxter* because of the word *for*, conclude these offices to be the cause of their justification? then let him also conclude, that the cause of Gods shewing mercy to *Paul* was his ignorance and unbeliefe. This will as well follow from those words of *Paul*, 1 Tim. 1. 13. *I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbeliefe.* To his condition the proper place is to speak afterward.

So the 1 Pet. 1. 17. who without respect of Persons judgeth according to every mans work, holds forth thus much to us, that God cannot be deluded or corrupted, as oft times earthly Iudges are, either to pervert justice for favour or carnall ends, or to take appearances for substance, but jugeth all both persons and actions according to what they are, not what they seem.

In like manner, 2 Cor. 5. 10. the Apostle appeales (as may ap-

peare by the 11. and 12. verſes compared with this) from the ſlanders and cenſures of the falſe Apoſtles to the judgment Seat of God. They had (it ſeems) queſtioned among the Corinthians, the ſincerity of both the Apoſtle and his Miniſtry: Hee refers all to Chriſt the Iudge. Before him wee muſt all appeare (ſaith he) and hee will reveale who are the ſincere, and which the hypocriticall Profeſſors and Preachers of Chriſt, they or I to take vengeance of the one, and to owne the other.

He mainteth that teſtimony of Rev. 20. 12, 13. that the force thereof may not be underſtood by his Reader. Let him ſupply what he hath cut off, the Book of life by which they which are in Chriſt are to be judged, which is there mentioned aſwel as the other books by which the world is to be judged, and then the judgments which the Saints are to paſs through wil appear to be a judgment of Grace, not of ſtrict juſtice; & to conſiſt in their admiſſion to the Kingdom after the tenour of Grace, not of Workes. The other three Scriptures he ſeeth to have ſo little even of ſhew in them for his uſe, that he deigns not the labour to alleage the words; and let him not expect that I ſhould ſtil do it for him.

Thus far we grant that the ſentence of Iudgement (though not the juſtifying ſentence) ſhall paſſe in the laſt day according to works. 1. The whole world that hath not heard of Chriſt, much leſs beleeved on him, ſhall be judged according to their works, to life or death, according as their works have been perfect or unperfect: yea to a meaſure of vengeance anſwering to the meaſure of their ſinnes, ſome to many, ſome to fewer ſtripes.

2. The whole bulk of profeſſed Chriſtians alſo ſhall [in this reſpect] be judged according to their works: *viz.* that as their profeſſions of and actings in Chriſt, were eyther in truth or in hypocriſie, meerly formall, or elſe Vitall and reall, ſo ſhall they be either exempted from, or adjudged unto vengeance. And ſo the ſecrets of all hearts ſhall bee then diſcloſed, the Sheep and Goats, Saints and Hypocrites ſhall then bee fully ſeperated one from the other, which untill that time ſhall never be wholly done, nor bee known to all whoſe works were vitall, and whoſe dead works.

3. That the very Saints as compared one with another, ſhall be judged according to their works, *i. e.* ſhall be adjudged to glory in ſeverall meaſures above, according to the ſeverall meaſures of their ſervices and ſufferings heere, is the opinion of many, eminent for learning and godlineſs; neither doe their Reaſons yet wholly ſway

me

me who dissent from them, and will have neither right hand nor left hand, nor sun, nor stars, nor great, nor small. but all equall in one degree of glory. It is no proper place heer to dispute it, but I see no reason to conclude that hee which distributeth his gifts of grace heer in different measures, may not so also there distribute the degrees of glory. Seeing both are by the purchase of his death, and whether by the former he puts us in a greater or lesser capableness of the later, is in question.

But in any other sense, how (as he sayth) the sentence of justification shall passe according to works, and that as hee infers from 2. Co. 5. 10. according to works, whether good or evill, I cannot conjecture. 1. Not according to works as they are a condition, (which is the next thing hee undertakes to prove) for evill works cannot be the condition of our justification, either negatively that if we have done evill, we neyther are nor shalbe justified; then all must bee damned: nor positively, that whosoever hath done evill, shall be justified; then all shall be saved. Nor 2. shall it passe so as that according to our good works we shall be justified, and according to our evill works we shall be condemned; then every man, at least every true Christian, should be both saved and damned. 3. Nor that we shalbe much justified if we have all good works, & little justified if we have done some evil works also, for that is the last judgment, where every man shall have a full discharge or no discharge. I must leave this as one of Mr. *Baxters* Mysteries, it must die with him (as to my understanding,) unless hee vouchsafe his interpretation.

As for the thing it selfe, I utterly deny that they which are in Christ shall be so judged or justified according to their works as other men, that they shall stand as prisoners with the world at the bar of Christ, to bee judged for life and death as the other, according to their works. What that the Lord Christ should then discover the nakedness, and lay open in the sight of men and divels all the sin and shame of his beloved members? That he should cast in their faces all the filth of all their originall and actuall pollution even when they are upon the threshold of heaven? Let it be Mr. *Baxters* doctrine, my eares are abhorrent from the sound thereof. It is against the stream of Gospel doctrine, which tells us that Christ hath born *their sin and curse, and done their law*, therfore they are not to be called to such a reckoning. *That their iniquities are forgiven and sins covered*, Ro. 4. 7. *That the Lord will no more remember them*

Heb. 10. 17. *That they are not under the Law, but under Grace* Ro. 6. 14. Therfore exempted from the accusations of the Law at the Bar of Justice, where the world is to be tried, and to receive no other judgement, but what flowes from the throne of grace. That *there is no condemnation to them; that the law of the spirit of life which is in Christ Jesus hath freed them from the law of sin and death*, Ro. 8. 1. 2. So that the Law hath no more power of judgment over them, than the lawes of our Land to try an Angel of Heaven for life and death. *That none can lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect, because God justifieth them, and who is he that is the judge and condemner? even Christ which is their Saviour*, Ro. 8. 33. 34. *That they are the sheep that shalbe first separated and set at the right hand of Christ, before he enters upon the judging of the world*, and so *freed from judgement by the mercy of God in separating them*, as *Augustine* well observeth. *That they shall not come into condemnation, but are passed from death to life*, Jo. 5. 24. That what to the world is the day of judgement, to these *is the day of Redemption*, Lu. 21. 28. They shall not come into judgement to answer for any one of their sins, as is well observed by Reverend Mr. *Fox*, the author of that which we call the *Book of Martyrs*, for (saith he) *Sublatâ offensâ, tollitur simul judicii obligatio*, *i. e.* The sin being taken away [*viz.* by the Lamb of God, as appears Io. 1. 29] all obligation of judgement is taken away with it.

Aug. de Consens. Evang. lib. 2. cap. 30.

De Christo gratis Justif. p. 336.

As for the works and righteousnes, which these Scriptures declare shalbe mentioned to beleevers in that their Jubilizing day, this speaks out the infinit freeness and riches of Gods grace in covering their nakedness, and setting forth only the beauty and ornaments which he hath put upon them: but in no wise any sufficient ground or reason upon which they might expect so great a salvation. Suppose a noble and indulgent Father hath a prodigall and rebellious son, that for many yeers hath grieved the spirit of his Father with his impure cariage, and exorbitant outrages, to whom notwithstanding his Fathers heart is no less indeared than was Davids to Absolom, therfore never hath a thought of disinheriting him, but reserves his whole heritage, together with a boundles treasure entire for him; in the mean while wooing and even melting him with loving kindness into love and duty: at length the son repenteth, becomes ashamed of his base carriage toward so good a Father, returns to him, waits on him, ministreth to him in his weaknes and sickness: and his Father by his last Will and Testament

gives

gives him all, naming him therin his good and beloved son that hath done him great service, ministred to him much comfort in the time of his necessity. Will any hence gather, that the attendance of such a son on such a Father at last, is a sufficient ground and reason for the Fathers setling on him so vast an estate? Could not the Father have hired a stranger for a few Crowns to have done him as much service? Doth not the mentioning of the sons good deeds which he would seem to reward with so rich munificence, speak out only the remarkable goodness of the Father, that hath buried in oblivion all the disobedience and mischiefs which his son hath committed, and will have his good parts alone to be mentioned? or if another that was not his son had done a thousand times more in his service should he have been entitled for it to the inheritance? So also in this case to attribute to the works of beleevers the reason or ground of their glorification becaus the Grace of Christ mentioneth them, is to lay the honour of Christs Grace in the dust. They that shall be glorified, even when Christ of his Infinite Grace extolleth their service done to him, shall depresse themselves, that the entire prayse may bee for Lord when did wee thus and thus minister to thee? what ever did we of any worth that thou shouldest owne it as a service to thee? what thou imputest is no otherwise our observance but in thy acceptance.

It is therefore denyed that the justfying sentence (as Mr *Baxter* termes it) shall passe in the last day either for or according to works, otherwise than hath beene before granted. And if wee shall not at last be glorified according to and for our workes, but that Mr. *Brs.* proofes in this particular faile; Then is his labour lost in going about to prove the second particular that the reason hereof is becaus they are parts of the condition. It must first appear that it is, before wee trouble our selves to know in what respect it is so. So that we will not contend about the second particular with him, to deny what he concludeth, that workes concurre in the same concausality with Faith to our glorification, 1. Not to evidence the truth of our Faith, nor secondly as the righteousness which the Law requireth, nor thirdly as a meer signe by which God doth discern our Faith, nor fourthly as a mere sign to satisfie the justified person himselfe, nor fiftly to satisfie the condemned world of the sincerity of our Faith. All this we grant, and further adde in the sixt place nor as a condition (in Mr *Baxters*) sense of our glorification. And becaus none of these or other wayes, therefore not at all.

The-

The Scriptures which he brings pa. 322. n. 5. that seeme to hold forth the promise of glorification for our workes, are of the same nature with those examined in the former Chapter alleaged by him and all (as those) gathered by the Papists to his hand, and either do conclude no more than what a little before we have in this Chapter granted, or pertaine to some of those ends of such promises of life which God maketh to our obedience, specified in the former chap. I shall therefore here pretermit to speak to them, because Mr *Baxter* alleageth them to another end here, *viz.* to prove that the mention of these works to judgement is more than to signifie their sincerity to the condemned world, as in the end of that Section he expresseth himselfe. And this we deny not. So that it were impertinent to examine the premises where the conclusion is granted.

Chap. IX.

whether according to Mr. Baxter, *Doe and live be the voice of the Gospel as well as of the Law? The question stated, and resolved whether, and in what respects Believers must act or work from life, not for life.*

IN the eighth place (as naturall motions are strongest when they come neerest to their period and center, so) at the conclusion of his Aphorismes, pag. 324. and so onward to the end, he multiplies Argument upon Argument, or rather twisteth many arguments together in one, under the notion of *Queries*; The substance of all may bee gathered together into this one Syllogisme.

That Doctrine which by necessary consequence draweth after it many intolerable absurdities, mischiefs, and soul-damning evills, must needs be a false doctrine.

But so doth the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, or by Christ instrumentally received by Faith, without the addition of works, in a concausality with Faith or Christ.

Ergo, It is a false doctrine.

The Proposition is granted him. The Assumption hee goeth about to cleer and make good, by enumerating the particular absurdities and mischiefs that are consequentiall to this Doctrine. And this

this he doeth by way of interrogations bearing the force of strong Affirmations. I shal examine them in order. The first query he puts in these words.

B. *Doth it not needlesly constraine men to wrest most plaine and frequent expressions of Scripture?*

A simple negation would here best suit with so untoward and audatious a question? Neither shall I say any more to it, but admonish the Reader to take notice, that hee doth in these words frame an enditement against Christ, his Apostles, and all that beare the name of Protestants, for sacriledge in wresting the holy Scriptures. And that, 1. Though he doth not (and why? but because he cannot) bring any one Scripture which they have so wrested. 2. And thereby affirmeth plaine enough to the capacity of every understanding reader, that the Papists and *Arminians* alone have purely and truely interpreted the Scriptures as to the point of justification, whom himselfe therefore followeth as their obedient disciple. And 3. shewes us no reason therof, but leaves us to conjecture what his meaning is, *viz.* that the Scripture is no farther Canonicall, than after the interpretation and sense which the holy Mother Church alloweth it.

Nay we retort the argument upon him. Iustification by works constraines the assertors thereof not onely to wrest many Scriptures, but also to destroy and nullifie the whole Gospell and Salvation of Christ. Therefore it is false doctrine.

This first query was but a warning peece, but who can stand to beare the force of the second? The man as if hee had newly come forth of *Vulcans* shop, is all fiery, spits out nothing but lightening and thunderbolts, blowing into the bottome of Hell all that stand in his way. How formidably he layes about him, they that dare to come so neer may finde partly in this second querie it selfe, but principally in his Appendix pag. 76. &c. and in the highest strength of his wrath, pag. 83. and onward to the end of pag. 98. First his querie here runs in these words:

B. pa. 324, and 325. 2 Qu: *Doth it not uphold that dangerous pillar of the* Antinomian *doctrine, that we must not work or perform our duties for life and salvation, but only from life and Salvation: That we must not make the attaining of Justification or salvation an end of our endeavours, but obey in thankfulnesse onely because we are saved and Justified? A*

doctrine which I have elſe where confuted. And if it were reduced to practiſe by all that hold it, (as I hope it is not) would undoubtedly damn them, for he that ſeeks not, and ſtrives not to enter, ſhall never enter. Now if good workes, or ſincere obedience to Chriſt our Lord, be no part of the condition of our full juſtification and ſalvation, who will uſe them to that end? For how it can procure juſtification as a meanes and not by way of condition, I cannot conceive.

In what part of the world Mr. *Baxters* [elſewhere] lyeth in which his confutation of this doctrine is to be found I know not, I am not inquiſitive to know. I have enough in this and deſire not to fiſh in any more of his foule waters.

But in pronouncing this doctrine of working and performing duties not for life, but from life and ſalvation, not to the end that we may be juſtified by them, but in thankfullneſſe for our juſtification by Chriſt without workes, to bee an *Antinomian* and damning doctrine if reduced to practice; he perremptorily pronounceth not onely all Proteſtant Churches and ſaints, but alſo Paul himſelfe an *Antinomian* and damned. For 1. that Paul and all the Apoſtles of Chriſt doe teach and urge upon all the Saints of Chriſt all diligence in good workes and duties, and fruitfulneſſe in obedience, in thankfulneſſe for their Iuſtification Mr. *Baxter* will not, cannot deny, for if he ſhould, he cannot be ignorant that he ſhall be forthwith overwhelmed with teſtimonies of Scriptures againſt him that himſelf muſt acknowledge unwreſted. Yea he muſt quench not only the light of the Goſpell, but alſo of reaſon and nature it ſelfe (which poſſibly are more authentique with him than Goſpell) to deny that we are to be really as well as verbally thankfull to God for his leaſt, much more for his greateſt benefits ſuch as are our Iuſtification and ſalvation.

But that the Apoſtle alſo teacheth that we are not to performe good works and duties that we may be juſtified and ſaved by them, is evident. *To him that worketh* (ſaith he) i. e. ſeeketh it by works, *the reward is reckoned not of grace but of debt*, ſhall be conferred on him if due in ſtrict Iuſtice, he muſt expect nothing from grace. *But to him that worketh not*, [ſeeks not the attainment therof by works] *his Faith is imputed to him for righteouſneſſe.* Ro. 4. 4. 5. to which he addeth the teſtimony of David, *pronouncing the man bleſſed to whom God imputeth righteouſneſſe without workes.* ver. 6, 7, 8. *By Grace*

Grace are ye saved through Faith, not of workes, least any man should boast Eph. 2. 8, 9. *we knowing that a man is justified by the workes of the Law, have believed in Christ Iesus that we might be justified by the Faith of Christ, for by the works of the Law none can be justified.* Gal. 3. 16. *Not by workes of righteousnesse which we have done but of his mercy he hath saved us,* Tit. 3. 5. *That no man is justified by the Law it is evident, for the just shall live by Faith.* The strength of the reasoning is in the opposition of the Righteousnesse by which the Gospell to that by which the Law justifieth. By Faith, therefore not by our finceerest and exactest study of the righteousnesse which the Law prescribeth. Gal. 2. 11. with many other testimonies, before frequently alledged. Lo heere the Apostle teaching the same doctrine which Mr. *Baxter* damneth, a working not for Iustfication by his workes, but from justification and in thankfulnesse for it. Yea hee reduceth it to practise also. [*We knowing that there is no justification by workes*] *have believed in Christ Jesus that we may be justified.* Gal. 2. 16. *I count all things dung that I may winn Christ and bee found in him, not having my owne Righteousnesse which is of the Law, but that which is through the Faith of Christ, the Righteousnesse of God by Faith.* Phil. 3. 8, 9 Behold wee heere in these Scriptures the Apostle teaching and reducing to practise every particle of the doctrine which Mr. *Baxter* heere damneth. What followeth? According to Mr. *Baxter* Paul is an *Antinomian*, and damned. Let me also be so damned with Paul the *Antinomian*, rather then justified in the way of Mr. *Baxters* justification. Mr. *Baxter* cannot evade here by any sophisticall interpretation of Pauls sense and meaning in these scriptures. For they which have delivered this doctrine of Paul in Pauls words, or in words equivalent professe themselves to hold it also in Pauls sence and meaning. So that Mr. *Baxter* in interpreting Pauls, interprets their meaning also: so that it is evident that his wrath here is against the very doctrine of Paul, though his pretence bee to blow up them onely which speake after him. But Mr. *Baxter* hath a greater authority than Paul can boast of for himselfe, to pronounce them all *Antinomians* and damned with Paul that followe Pauls doctrine, *viz.* the determination of the Holy councell of Trent which hath thus concluded, *Si quis dixerit &c.* If any shall say that a man is justified by Faith alone without workes, let him be accursed. Who dares now to equallize Pauls Tent to the Popes Throne and so many Cardinals and Bishops palaces?

As to the matter it selfe, it is all sophisticall and fallatious that Mr. *Baxter* here delivereth. Let him bring that *Antinomian* to light that hath ever taught that we must not labour and strive for justification and salvation, against whom his Argument may holde good that he must needs bee damned, because he that seeketh not and striveth not to enter shall never enter. Some indeede by expressing themselves too briefly have given occasion to Mr. *Baxter* and such as he is, to catch a phrase or sentence from them that may smel of some absurdity as considered in it selfe and by its selfe: such as is that which he heer mentioneth, we must work from life, and not for life. But if the scope of the Authors in such phrases be gathered, from that which went before, and that which followeth, it will appear clearly they meant, we are not to work and perform duties to this end that wee may bee justified and saved by such works as works and duties, but to perform them in love and thankfulnes to him that justifieth us freely of meer grace, without works, through the Redemption which is by Christ Jesus. And this is the Question betweene Mr. *Baxter* and the Papists on the one part, and the Antinomians, *i. e.* the Protestants on the other part, whether wee must perform good works and duties to bee justified and saved by them and for them so performed, yea by them or for them as they are our inherent righteousnes, our perfect, possible, and meritorious Righteousnes? All which he affirms, and the Protestants with one consenting voice deny: as hath been before, and may after, before we part from Mr. *Br.* be more fully manifested.

What he concludes with as a notable absurdity and inconvenience that will befall his doctrine of works, if we will not say what he sayth: [viz. *If good works bee no part of the Condition of our full justification and salvation, who will use them to that end? For how it can procure justification as a meane, and not be the condition therof, I cannot conceive.*] Besides his fallacy before noted in arguing from justification and salvation simply and indefinitely taken, to a full justification and salvation of his own devising, and so controvertibly again from this latter to that former: it concerns him to look to the inconvenience and danger, which useth and practiseth, not to us which use not good works to that end. And now is his time to consider, that his full justification, when hee thinks to possesse it, do not evaporate into no justification, no salvation.

Now to make way for the examination of what hee hath more largely to this purpose in his Answer to the tenth & eleventh Questions

stions in his Appendix, and to shew how hee there fights with his own phantasm, feigns an Adversary and then quells him, falls out with his own shadow, never comming neer that which hee hath made to be the Question between him and the Protestant Churches, but when the Adversary is Eastward, hee rides out in indignation Westward, beating every bush and wounding every bough that he meets with, proclayming it an Adversary, and so returns at last with as much gallantry, as ever did *William* the Conquerour: it shall be expedient (for the disabusing of such as are apt in this kind to bee abused) to premise something for the right stating of the Question heer controverted.

First then the doings, duties, and works, about which the Question is conversant, are of two kinds, Legall or Evangelicall, such as have their foundation in that law which is of Natural and Moral, or such as are founded on precepts and doctrines of Gospell Positive right. By the former I mean such works and duties as the naturall conscience (specially if holpen by the written Law) can apprehend to be, and urge upon man as duty though there had never been a Christ or Gospell to adde further light. By the later I meane such duties, as are only in generall comprehended in the Law, [whatsoever the Lord shall at any time declare to bee his will, and impose upon thee as thy duty, thou shalt observe and do] but cannot possibly be known in speciall to bee duties, without a new revelation from heaven, such as the Gospell is. The former duties are naturall, founded in Nature it selfe: the later supernaturall, because without a supernaturall manifestation they cannot be known, and without a supernaturall power infused they cannot bee effectually performed. All this Mr. *Br.* himselfe granteth in this his Treatise, saving the very last clause, which also because I finde him not any where flatly denying, I shall forbear to prove, taking it as granted with the rest.

2. That this naturall righteousnes and obedience was the Condition of the Old Covenant, as to life, and so remayneth still to them that remayn under the Old Coveant, but so as that no man living can be saved by it since Adams fall, but that whosoever is saved, the same is saved after the tenour of the New Covenant, *i. e.* the Covenant of Grace or the Gospel. This also Mr. *Baxter* hath frequently taught and granted.

3. That the duties of the New Covenant are of two sorts, either more or lesse principall; the more principall is fayth, or re-

ving and embracing the Lord Christ; together with the justificati-
on and salvation that are by him. The lesse principall duties (which
are also pure Gospel duties) are such as are subservient to faith, or
to the receiving of Christ alone to justification, quickening, illumi-
nation, sanctification, &c. or to the reteyning of him and fuller
closing with him to all these & all other Evangelical ends, for which
he is given to us by the Father. These 3. Positions are so frequently
granted by Mr. *Baxter* in this his Book, that I forbear to quote the
places.

4. That justification and salvation, as the Scripture terms them
a reward, (if indeed it doth ever so term justification, as properly
and strictly taken) may bee considered first as benefits already con-
ferred and in our possession, in part or in the whole, or else as re-
wards heerafter to be conferred; the ground and foundation wher-
of was layd in our first conversion and union to Christ by faith, to-
gether with the earnest and pledge of the spirit given to us by God
to assure us of our full possession of all the fruits therof in the future.
And 2. if future, the Gospel propoſeth these as rewards of his free
grace and benignity, or else as rewards of debt, due to our service
and for the service done to him. Neither in this can Mr. *Baxter* op-
pose or dissent.

5. Then to come home and close to the Question, it remains to
be expressed how far all these duties are to be done for life, I mean
how far all or any kind of these are to bee performed for the attay-
ing of justification and salvation as a reward, and how far onely in
love and thankfulness for the reward already made ours in possessi-
on or in hope.

1. We grant, that they which are wholly under the Old Cove-
nant, having never the Gospel revealed unto them, are bound to
seek justification and salvation by the works of the Law or natu-
rall righteousness still: but they shall never attaine what they
seek, because they are impotent to fulfill the condition. Yet their
unableness is no prejudice to Gods authority and obligation upon
them. It is otherwise with them that live under the Gospel, to
have the Covenant of Grace in Christ revealed to them, but have
not yet so effectually received Christ by faith as to bee justified and
declared righteous within their own souls: These are indeed to seek
for justification and salvation, yet not by the workes of the Law
or legall, naturall, and meerly morall righteousnesse, for this were
to reject the new Covenant or Gospel, with the justification which

by Christ, and to hold themselves fast under the old Covenant in an incapacity to be justified and saved: The best works of naturall righteousnes which they can performe, being but dead works of dead men, like the stinch of Carrion, offensive to the pure nosthrills of God, who will therefore condemn, not justifie for them.

2. They that are in Christ and have obtayned justification and inchoat salvation by him, *i.e.* have their conscience absolved and freed from sin and obligation to vengeance, by faith in his bloud, are to perform those works of naturall righteousnes, not for life, but from life, not to procure thereby the life of justification, (for they have it already in Christ, and to seek it more compleatly to be perfected by such works, is as hath been before shewed, *to be so foolish as having begun in the spirit,* [to seeke] *to bee perfected by the flesh*) but in duty and thankfulnes for so full and free a pardon and absolution, which all our doings, all our sufferings are insufficient to answer; Nevertheles the intuition of so great a redemption already attayned and in our possession, together with the promise of so glorious an inheritance for the future life, already confirmed to us by the seal of the spirit in the bloud of Christ, are of such infinite value that we are to walk still in the splendor and glory of it, so that our spirits should bee sublimated above earth and selfe, to dwell, and to spend our selves, and be spent in the bosome of that Grace, from which wee have received so much, and expect yet so much more of ravishing and never ending felicity. *What neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man in a naturall way conceived,* of the riches of the incomprehensible bounty and free grace of God, being once revealed to us, and made ours in possession, or in hope, ought so to spiritualize us, so to swallow us up into the spirit that we should no longer *walk after the flesh, but after the spirit, to delight in the Law of God, in all the holiness and righteousnes which the Law teacheth, after the inner man.* He that seeks not so to doe, hath hugd in his arms a dream of Christ, not Christ himselfe, hath had him possibly in his fancy, never in his heart and conscience. Hee that hath effectually met with God in Christ, reconciling the world to himselfe, and there tasted the love of God, or rather God which is love, hath suffered a Metamorphosis, and is changed all into love, hath so beheld God shining in Christ, *as in a glasse, that he is transformed into the same image,* is or would bee wholly configured to the likeness of God. Gal 3.3.

Yea, we grant more, that the truly justified and adopted ones of the

the Lord, may perform these works of naturall righteousnes which the Law commandeth, with respect to and expectation of the future glory which shall be revealed to them and conferred on them for Christs sake, as a reward of such their imperfect service; yet not a reward of debt purchased by and due to their works, but of free gift and grace from their indulgent father, who of his infinite love and bounty is wont to recompence the mites of his dear childrens labours, with the talents of his grace and bounty, not because they are worthy, but because he is gracious, yea Grace and Love it selfe, Ro. 4 4. 5. *Goe ye into my vineyard, and whatsoever is right* [*or meet*] *ye shall receive*, Mat. 20. 7. It must bee a boundless reward what such a father shall think right and meet to bestow upon his dear children. Their reward shall bee proportioned, not to the pittance of their poore service, but to the riches of their fathers bounty, and uncircumscriptivenes of his treasure. The respect of such infinite treasure in their fathers hand, and the riches of his love to bestow it in largest dimensions upon them, with a gracious respect to their dutifulnes, and service, should serve as a strong motive and attractive to them to be still doing for him. *When I was yet in my blood, hee loved and cleansed me*, Ezek. 16. 6, - 9. *When dead, he quickned me* Eph. 2. 1. *When without strength to work, When a sinner, when ungodly, when an enemy, he gave his son to die for me, and reconciled me to himselfe:* What will he now doe for mee so quickned, reconciled, washed, and justified, having attained strength, if I employ that strength in his service? Ro. 5. 6--10. *Now we are the sons of God, but it doth not yet appear what wee shall bee, only we know that When he appears We shall bee like him, having therefore this hope, we ought to purifie our selves as he is pure*, 1. Jo. 2. 25. 3. Thus are the saints to draw encouragement to obedience, from the consideration of the reward, or rather from the infinite love and bounty of the rewarder.

3. That they which are out of Christ, (yet under the means of Grace, and Ministry of the Gospel) must p rforme all pure Gospel duties (which the Law requireth onely in generall and implicitely, but the Gospel specifieth expresly) to the severall ends to which the wisdome of God hath severally related them; some to justification, some to sanctification by Christ Jesus. It is their duty to hear, learn, study, and meditate, upon the doctrine of Grace, and mystery of Christ, duly to prize and value it, to desire, gasp, cry, and pray for the effectuallizing of it to themselves, to embrace and receive

Christ,

Christ, to repent of their long estrangednes from him, to deny themselves, and cast away all opinion of and confidence in their owne righteousnes, that Christ alone may bee embraced, and the dung being cast out, they may bee repleniſhed with that which is indeed the Treasure: and all this that they may bee justified and saved, not by and for these duties so performed, but by and for Christ to whom they seek and strive in all these duties to come into union. All this the Gospel both tacitely implieth and expresly teacheth: and the Law also in generall and inclusively commandeth as hath been sayd, Thus *the Kingdome of Heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.* Here stil Christ is al to justification, & salvatiõ & Faith the alone instrument to receive him All the other actings are but subservient to Faith in this its instrumentall service to make way for it. As when a treasure is offered by a munificent benefactor to a poor beggar, the grace of the benefactor and pretiousnesse of the treasure is that which inricheth him, and the hand the alone instrument to receive it; yet must the eye guide him, the understanding prompt him, the wil move him, the feet carry him, and other actings of the minde and body bee subservient to him, that the hand may receive that which inricheth him. At length when all is done, such a begger hath more apparent grounds of boasting that hee hath been, and done somewhat to his owne enriching, than the best of us that we have been or done any thing to our own Justification. For though the Benefactor hath poured upon him freely of his own mercy, not for, or upon condition of his crying, running to him, emptying his hand of what was in it before, and stretching it forth to bee filled with the treasure profered him: yet the benefactor gave him neither a heart to desire nor wisdome to value, nor light to guide him, nor feet to carry him, nor a hand to receive the treasure conferred. It is otherwise in our Justification by Christ. God freely gives it in Christ, and all the power, will, actings, and instruments by which we come into the possession of it. Neither when we affirme all these to be our duty while yet unjustified, doe we thereby affirme that all must be done before we can bee justified. The grace of God oft prevents our operation in most of these, justifying us by Faith, before we have time to put our selves upon many of these operations. In this sense I know none that denieth an obligation upon sinners to act and worke for their justification and salvation.

4. They that are justified ought to be still active and industrious

in all the duties of the Gospell tending to their confirmation in the Faith, stablishment in Christ, illumination in the misteries of the Gospell, denyall of themselves, and seeking to be wholly swallowed up into the Lord Iesus, that they may be dayly more filled and ravished with fuller assurance and comfort of their justification & salvation by him. This we find the Apostle making his taske, Phill. 3. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. And hereunto tend the many memento's scattered by the holy Ghost in the Gospell, watch, pray, take heed, beware, stand fast, hold fast, Run, fight, strive, continew &c. All which tend to the laying not of such our labours, but Christ Jesus about whom these our labours are to be exercised, as the foundation of happinesse more and more fixedly within our soules. Whatsoever Gospell duties and labours God hath ordeined for the faster setling of us upon the Rock of Righteousnes, the emptying our selvs of our nothingnesse, and making Christ our all, those all are to be done by the saints not onely from life, but also for life to be had and confirmed to them not in these duties, but in Christ more and more formed and perfected in them to righteousnesse and salvation by these their religious indeavours.

These four Conclusions I know none of the Protestant (or as Mr. *Baxter* terms them Antinomian) Teachers denying. Whatsoever therefore he bringeth not thwarting and opposing some of these Assertions, he doth but *Oleum & operam ludere*, spend time and wit to prove that which none denieth, and to oppose that which none teacheth and patronizeth. These things therefore thus premised, it is easie to answer all that he will seeme to himselfe to have laid impregnably for justification by works in his Appendix.

To begin with pag. 76. of that his Appendix, and passing over that bold peremptory Pharisaicall and popish Assertion, that *Do this and live*, is the language both of the Law and the Gospel, together with the explication and feigned sense of [*Do and live*] as it is the voice of the Gospel, p. 77. (there being nothing for, but all against this doctrine throughout the whole Gospel, as hath been already fully proved) all that he brings for the confirmation of it in the sense in which he will be understood, is ineffectuall to this end. All his posiions pag. 78, 79, 80. may in the sense before mentioned, be granted him, *viz.* 1. *That a wicked man or unbeliever may and must labour to obtaine the first life of Grace.* 2. *That a man may all for the increase of this spirituall life when he hath it.* 3. *That we may and must all for the life of Reconciliation, Justification, and Adoption.*

tion. 4. *That we may act for the assurance of both our Justification and Sanctification.* 5. *That we may act for Eternall Salvation.*

All these things are wholly besides the question, and no more either powerfull or proper to prove that [Do and live] (in the sense which he affirmeth and all Protestans deny) to be the voice and Tenour or scope of the Gospel, than if he had said nothing at all. He might expect the beguiling of the simple, but not of any knowing and considerative person with this dispute of his totally alien from the matter about which he disputeth. For himselfe knoweth, that they which use this Phrase, [*We must work from life, not for life*] do in this expression. 1. Speak only of those that are already alive in Law againe, *i. e.* justified and absolved from all their sins through faith in Christs bloud, and so delivered from the Curse and death of the Law: 2. That they mean principally, if not only the *life of Justification, reconciliation, and Adoption*, that they which in respect of this life, are already alive before God of meere Grace, uniting them to Christ which is their Life, ought not to seek the same life by works, as if it were not already attained; for this were to reject Grace and Christ as insufficient to Life, and to flye to works as either alone sufficient, or without which Grace and Christ are not sufficient to it. 3. That if at any time by and under this expression they comprize besides the life of Justification, &c. here, the life of glory hereafter also; in excluding our acting and working for it, they exclude them only as our acts and workes, *i. e.* as acts and works either of Gods worship, or of righteousnes and charity towards our neighbour commanded by the Law of Nature, by the righteousnesse thereof to live: Not those Gospel duties of Gods ordination to be subservient to our union unto and receiving of Christ to bee our alone righteousnesse by which to live. This way themselves doe, and teach all, both believers and unbelievers to act for life. The sum of their doctrine about Justification and salvation breathing out it selfe in calling all from all iniquity to the fountain of Christs bloud for cleansing, and from all confidence in the righteousnes of their owne workes to put on him alone for their alone righteousnesse at Gods Tribunall. Whatsoever acting and working there is in selfe-searching, selfe-denyall, selfe-renouncing, whatsoever in the study, knowing, desiring, seeking, comming to Christ, that they may receive and retaine him to bee their sole and whole life and righteousnesse.

All this they doe, and teach to bee done and that for life. This

way (say they) the Kingdome of Heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it (yea hold it also) by force. Nevertheless even these Actings they disclaim also as by their righteousnes interessing to Christ and life in him; and will no otherwise act by these for life, but as they are ordinately subservient to Faith and to living by Faith, *i. e.* by Christ whom Faith apprehendeth. Even Faith it selfe [as an act or work justifying] they explode, leaving it to the Papists, Socinians, Arminians, and among these to Mr. *Baxter* which heere pag. 80. of his Appendix, as elsewhere teacheth it.

So the question is not, when God of the freenes and riches of his Grace, doth offer unto us Christ with Righteousnes, and life in him as a free gift; whether we ought to act and work for the receiving and holding of it, or not? But whether wee ought to work ordinately as God prescribeth, or inordinately as Mans mad God Reason fancieth. We only deny that when such a gift is so offered we ought to run with fist, foot, sword, and club, to force it out of Gods hand as our due, (as they doe which after the doctrine of Mr. *Baxter* and his Masters invade God with their works, to claime it as due to their righteousnes;) But we teach men to lie prostrate in the sense of their own vilenes, gasping after it and receiving it as a free gift of Mercy; granting man in the very first acting of his will toward Christ, and Gods acting upon him to draw him to Christ, the relation of more then a naturall patient, (not pronouncing him a stock or stone as our Adversaries object to us) even of obedientiall subjection (as they term it in the Schools) and ever after of a free Agent to fetch life and motion from Christ by the spirit.

Thus far and no further doe we grant [doe and live] to bee the voyce of the Gospel, *viz.* as there is a doing in receiving Christ and adhering to him; and as the will in receiving Christ, is as well an Agent as a Patient. Mr. *Baxters* sense wee reject, and have spoken to his reasons heer brought to confirm it. And whatsoever he hath sayd elswhere, hath been before examined.

As to the Scriptures which he quoteth to confirm his 5. Position, p. 80. and his glorying that they prove wee may act for salvation, p. 81. which as generally posited by him no man ever denied: there is no need of answering, that which they are brought to prove being granted. At length in the same pa. 81. of his App. he frameth an objection made against his doctrine thus:

B. *Object. But is it not the most excellent and Gospel-like frame of spirit, to doe all out of meere Love to God, and from thankefulnesse for life obtained by Christ and given us?*

To this Objection he gives a three-fold Answer.

Bax. Answ. 1. *If it come not from love to God it is not sincere.*

But is it sincere if it come from love to God? Is there not as well a naturall love as a naturall fear of God in the hearts of all both good and bad? Or was there ever any that hated God as God and good? Or that served him from hatred to him? If such a Naturall or Morall Love (for I finde not Mr. *Baxter* ascending any where higher,) suffice to make the obedience of men sincere, and because sincere, a perfect and sufficient righteousnes to justification and salvation; Then all will more fitly cohere than the golden crowne with the golden pantofle: a universall conditioning righteousnesse, with a universall conditionall salvation. All shall be saved (except the Antinomian Paulites, or Protestants) if Mr. *Baxters* Gospel stand: if he misse, none else but they.

B. 2. *Yet doth not the Gospel any where set our love to God and to our own soules in opposition; nor teach us to love God and not our selves: but contrarily joyneth them both together, and commandeth them both. The love of our selves and desire of our own preservation, would never have been planted so deeply in our nature, by the God of Nature, if it had been unlawfull.*

I conclude therefore, that to love God and not our selves, and so to do all without respect to our own good, is no Gospel frame of spirit.

As home to the matter as his doctrine of Justification to the truth. Where was conscience when will and wit alone shew themselves to beguile his Readers with meere opinions and imaginary fansies? Who ever opposed the ordinate love of God to the ordinate and subordinate love of our selves? When he hath degra-

ded us from being men, yea into a ſtate beneath Beaſts and bruits, telling the world that we doe not *appetere bonum*, deſire and move unto any thing that is good, yea our chiefe good, thenceforth hee thinks the world in ſtead of hearing will trample us, as other ſtocks and ſtones that have no ſenſitive appetite. Our doctrine is of another frame. Wee oppoſe the love of God which is from the ſpirit of Adoption, (not from Nature) to the ſervile feare which is from the ſpirit of Bondage: following heerin the light and teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt, Ro. 8. 15. 1. Jo. 4. 18. And this I doubt not, to be alſo the meaning of the Apoſtle, Gal. 5. 6. where hee makes the all on our part to juſtification, conſiſt in Faith, which worketh by love, *i. e.* in faith which carrieth out the beleever to work, not more in ſlaviſh fear and by a mercenary ſpirit, but in the freedome and ſpirit of Love.

And whoſoever will but vnwinde the Clew of *Pauls* diſputation in the whole 4. Chapter, eſpecially from verſe 21. and ſo forward to this 6. verſe of Chap. 5. ſhall I think have the ſuffrage of his own Reaſon for this interpretation. For the Apoſtle having diſputed of the bondage diſcending from *Hagar* to *Iſmael* and his Children from Mount *Sinai* to thoſe that held themſelves under the Covenant of Works [Doe and live] there given; and withall of the Freedom diſcending from *Sarah* to *Iſaac* and his ſeed, *viz.* the ſeed of Chriſt then included in and typified by *Iſaac*, *i. e.* from the New and ſpirituall *Jeruſalem* to all true Chriſtians, concludes of all ſuch *We are not the Children of the bond woman, but of the free*: and in 5. Chap. verſe 1. exhorting them to *ſtand faſt in the liberty, wherewith Chriſt hath made them free*; And forbidding, and in the next 3 verſes ſhewing the danger of returning againe under the ſervile yoke of the Covenant of works [Do and live] whereas by Faith and not by works, the hope of Righteouſneſs is to be expected, he concludes in the ſixth verſe, that neither circumſition nor uncircumſition, (*i. e.* neither workes, nor any externall priviledges of the workers) avail any thing (to life and righteouſneſſe) *but Faith which worketh by love*; what is that but Faith which worketh by a new principle of filiall love and not from that olde principle of ſervile feare the proper adjunct of the Covenant of workes? This is to be the Children of the free not the bond woman, by the Faith of Chriſt alone to ſeek for righteouſneſſe, yet to be ſtill working from a principle of love not of feare to bring forth fruits of ſanctification to him that hath freely juſtified us. *The man ſaith the Apoſtle hath entred into*

his rest as God hath entred into his rest. Heb. 4. 10. *As God having consummated the worke of Creation, rested and ceased from his Worke, because all was perfect and needed no addition; and Christ having offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever, sat downe at the right hand of God, ceasing from further sufferings*, because our redemption is fully perfected and nothing more needed to bee added: Heb: 10. 12. 14. So every beeleever in respect of the rest of Grace, having received by Faith the righteousnesse which is by this one sacrifice of Christ for the purging of all his sins, sitteth downe for ever at rest in the fruition and firme tenure thereof, ceasing from his owne workes to perfect his justification because it is already compleated and nothing needeth to be added to it. All his workings henceforth is to manage so great a salvation to the glory of the Author, as God worketh hitherto and Christ worketh, for the governing and disposing to their proper ends the Creatures made, and elect men redeemed.

Mr. *Baxter* contrariwise teacheth men so to love themselves as with love to destroy themselves, and so to seek for life as to be sure to lose it; forbidding them to *enter into their Rest of Grace*, and *taking them back to the yoke of bondage againe*; not suffring them to cease from their owne workes, nor to *doe that worke of God*, Jo. 6. 29. nor to act in the Sp. of love, but of feare and bondage. Is not he one of those hard Taskmasters from whose cruelty Christ calleth his Disciples, *Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden*, [with the yoakes and burthens which your legall Teachers impose on you,] *and I will give you rest*? &c. These will never permit you to have rest to your soules, Mat. 11. 28, 29.

I conclude therefore, that Mr. *Baxter's* Conclusion of this his second Answer to the Objection, is as pat to the purpose as an Oyster-shell to a hungry appetite: and the love to our selves which he teacheth, to tend only to selfe-ruining.

B. 3. *Thankefulnesse for what we have received (either in possession, title, or promise,) must be a singular spur to duty. But I pray you tell me, Have you received all the life and mercy you doe expect? Are you in Heaven already? Have you all the Grace that you need or desire in degree? If not, why may you not labour for what you have not as well as be thankefull for what you have? Or have you as full a certainty of it hereafter as you desire? If not, why may you not labour for it?*

All

Al this is also totally besides the Quæstiõ, which is not whether we may, but how we are to labour, whether with that most excellent and Gospel-frame of spirit consisting in love and thankfulnesse, or mercenarily by works? and whether in the way of Faith which the Gospel, or of naturall Righteousnes which the Law teacheth? *Many shall seeke to enter and shall not bee able*, saith the Master. *We through the spirit wait for the hope of Righteousnes by Faith*, saith the Apostle: Not so, but by and for our Works, not at all by Faith, but as it is an act or worke, saith Mr. *Baxter*, let him shew his light and Authority to be greater than *Pauls*, before hee looke that wee should run after him.

I shall put one question to him arising from the last of his Interrogatories, which will be harder for him to resolve than a thousand such as he hath here wil be to us. When hee tels us we must labour for the full certainty of Heaven hereafter; is there any such certainty in this world attainable according to his principle of but a conditionall justification and salvation untill the day of Judgement? or how is it to be obtained? Let him make it out to us. If he doth it, I shall conclude, that he can also turne Heaven into Earth, and Earth into Heaven, and nothing to bee unpossible to him: if not, let his Reader judge whether his indeavour be to delude, or else to teach.

In the next Chapter or Section, if wee attend onely to the sound and roare of words, Mr. *Baxter* appeares more formidable from pag. 83. to the 98. of his Appendix, in which hee presents us with thirteen Considerations, *to shew the vanity, and intolerable damnable wickednesse of this* [*supposed*] *doctrine, which he oppoſeth.* But the whole stoud of his wit, wrath, and eloquence, heere poured out together, runs into the dead Sea, by a desart and desolate way in which it meets with no mortall creature to wet or hurt it. For who is there of all mankinde that hath said wee ought not to act for life in the sense which this man suborneth, or otherwise than I have before oft expressed? Much lesse is there any professed Christian that hath asserted (as hee insinuateth) *That we must not come to Christ that we may have life*, nor *strive to enter in at the straite gate*, nor *lay violent hands on the Kingdome of Heaven*, nor *lay up for our selves a Treasure in Heaven*, nor *seeke the Kingdome of God and the Righteousnesse thereof*, nor *presse on for the attainment of the Resurrection? &c.* Let him be named by Mr. *Baxter*, that he may be brought forth and stoned which thus blaspheemeth, I

shal

shall not hinder it. That which they teach is that Workes are not to be performed to this end, that as works or doing as opposed to believing, by, and for their owne, or our owne Righteousnesse in doing them, they should put us into the possession of the life of justification and blessednesse.

If Mr. *Baxter* have any thing to say against this assertion, or against that which I before laid as the state of the question, it wilbe taken into examination: till then I shall leave him to fight with his owne shaddow, having no loose time to spend in gazing upon the activity of such a Combatant.

Chap. X.

Arg. *The Authour of the Booke intituled,* The Marrow of Moderne Divinity, *vindicated from the Aspersions wherewith Mr.* Baxter *defameth him and his Doctrine.*

Heere because I am to follow, and my taske is, not to leave Mr. *Baxter* untill I have examined all that hee saith to prove Justification by works; I am necessitated to fall into that which will be judged a Digression.

After hee hath enacted by a Law, that to say, wee must not worke for life, is a Blasphemy, or at least an intolerable errour, and to hold it practically a necessarily damning Doctrine, that whosoever doth it must be everlastingly damned for it. (All which wee acknowledge to bee in some sense true after the sound of the words, though after the meaning of the Authour they can never be saved which practically hold the contrary, as possibly I shall afterwards shew.) Now he proceeds to indite and arraigne to condemnation one Authour, as guilty of this damning Doctrine, *viz.* The Authour of the Book called, *The Marrow of Moderne Divinity*, and many his Accessaries, *viz.* all those Divines that have

annexed their approbatory subscriptions to the usefullnesse of it; so finde we the man expressing himselfe, *Aphorism.* pag 330.

B. *When such a Book as that stiled the Marrow of Modern Divinity, can have so many applauding epistles of such Divines: when the doctrine of it is that we must not ABide for justification and Salvation; but only in thankfulnesse for it.*

This he speaketh onely in generall, we shall finde his particulars following. To this therefore I answer onely in generall;

1 That it were to bee desired that Mr. *Baxter* had inured no more dishonour upon those Divines to whom he dedicates his book by such his dedication; than those forementioned Divines have attracted to themselves by their applauding epistles.

2 And that those Divines, with Mr. *Baxter* himselfe, could mention so many sound parts in his booke, both in the matter and ends of the Author; as hee hath picked out imaginary errours in the other.

3 As to the doctrine of that booke which he so accuseth, I shall there examine in particulars where Mr. *Baxter* particularly drawes it into accusation and judgement.

Onely by the way let me thus far excuse my selfe.

1 I never knew who was the Author of that worke.

2 Neither have I read it otherwise than here and there a fragment as I found it lying in my friends houses; so that I could no otherwise judge of it but *ex ungue Leonem*, what the whole was but by that which my slender judgement told me the part which I read was, not onely orthodox but singularly usefull.

3 That I never knew there was a second part of it, much lesse saw it until Mr *Baxter* by his quotation therof so told me. But that since I have gotten both parts, yet by meanes of other imployments have not had time any further to read it but where Mr. *Baxter* accuseth it of error.

4. That if I knew the Author to be yet living, I should have wholly left the defence of himselfe to himselfe. It was not so much the animosity as the ingenuity of *Scaliger* which caused him when he heard that one had busied himselfe about the correcting of the errors in his writings, to cry out, *Ego meos corrigam errores*, I my selfe will be the corrector of my owne errors. The same taske may this

this Author justly challenge to himselfe (if living) to be himselfe the defender of his owne writings. Perhaps he is doing it, perhaps he hath done it. I shall therefore in my uncertainty what is done, onely with such brevity seeke to disabuse the doubting readers of both, that I shall in no wise prevent the Authors fuller vindicating of his owne or rather Gods cause in his hand. Let us then attend to Mr *Baxters* accusations, particularized, *Append.* pag. 100. and so onward. It was questioned as may be seen pag. 99. *why he excepted against the Book called the Marrow of Modern Divinity?* he answers there, *because it is guilty of this heinous doctrine.* This he begins now pag. 100 to shew in particulars, alleaging first the words of that booke thus:

B M. M. pag. 174. (he meanes 179) *Qu. Would you not have believers to eschew evill and do good, for feare of Hell or for hope of Heaven? Answ. No indeed, I would not have any believer to doe the one or the other, for so farr as they doe so, their obedience is but slavish &c. To which end he alleageth.* Lu. 1. 74. 75.

Having thus alleaged the Author, he thus endeavours to accuse and confute him:

B *But that speaks of freedom from feare of our enemies; such as Christ forbids* Lu. 12. 5. *where yet he commandeth the fearing of God, and consequently even that feare of enemies is forbidden, as they stand in opposition to God, and not as his instruments in subordination. Or if it be even a feare of God that is there meant, yet is it not be all feare of him and his displeasure: So farr as we are in danger of sin and suffering, we must fear it: and so far as our assurance is still unperfect: a jealousie of our owne hearts and a dreadfull Reverence of God also are necessary. But not the legall terrors of the former bondage such as arise from the apprehension of sin unpardoned, and of God as being our enemy.*

Who ever heard any doctrine more unanswerably proved to bee sinnous? If any man question by what Argument? he can easily answer

ſwer himſelfe, by this that Mr. *Baxter* trying and finding himſelfe unable to do it, at length grants it to be ſound and good. Thus are they driven oft-times to wound themſelves who draw the Sword againſt the Truth. The Author of that booke proveth that beleevers or the redeemed of Chriſt are no longer to ſerve for feare of Hell by the teſtimony of the H.G. Lu. 1. 74. 75. That we being deliveréd out of the hands of our enemies might ſerve him without fear, in holineſſe and righteouſneſſe &c. Mr. *Baxter* to evade the force of this ſcripture, firſt contendeth that by enemies are here to be underſtood not ſpirituall but mortall enemies, wicked men and their perſecutions. Now may not a blind man perceive this to bee a ſhifting not an anſwer of this Scripture?

1. The groũd of this not fearing is here layd to be our deliverãce out of their hands, whom elſe we ſhould feare. And will Mr. *Baxter* ſay that Chriſt came to deliver his elect from the perſecutions of men, and not from ſin, death, hell, which were our moſt formidable enemies? This were to make Chriſts kingdome to be of this world, and to joyn with the carnall Iewes that expected ſuch a carnall Chriſt and carnall kingdome that might be eminent in the world.

2. Or hath he actually purchaſed to us ſuch a deliverance? doth not experience declare the contrary?

3. Or muſt we ſo long ſuſpend our ſerving of God in Righteouſneſſe and Holineſs untill we be actually delivered from all feare and danger of mens perſecutions? For ſo runs the Text as well in the originall as in our tranſlation, that the deliverance is layd as the ground of the ſervice, and that put in our poſſeſſion, before this can be put in execution, at leaſt without feare.

4. Is not deliverance heere the ſame thing with the ſalvation mentioned ver. 77, which Iohn was to preach? but that was ſalvation, and ſo is this deliverance, *by the remiſſion of ſins*; and conſequently we muſt ſerve (who are in Chriſt,) *without feare of vengeance and Hell.*

He ſees that with this evaſion he cannot decline the edge of this Scripture; therefore takes up the right interpretation of it at laſt, thus: *Or if it be even a feare of God that is there meant &c.* Why had he not ſpoken full to the point in queſtion and ſaid *the feare of Hell?* This minſing will nothing help him. All that he ſaith againſt it in this ſenſe, is but ſuch as is wont to proceed from the extravagancy of an aſtoniſhed and ſelf confounded man. For who ever ſaid that a beleever muſt caſt off all feare of God and not be poſſeſſed ſtill with

a

a filiall feare to displease him? *Or that as farr as he is in danger of sin and suffering he must not feare it, to shun it? Or that so farr as our assurance is still unperfect* [*or perfect*] *a jealousy of our own harts and a dutifull Reverence of God are* [*not*] *necessary?* But what is all this to the serving of God for feare of Hell? How doth he daub with untempered morter? At length he determines the question. *But not the legall terrors of our former bondage, such as arise from the apprehension of sin unpardoned, and of Gods being, our enemy.* I need to say no more, but where then is the feare of Hell in a beleever? doeth it arise from the apprehension of the pardon of his sin, and of God reconciled to him in Christ? what can be said more weakly to confute, or more strongly to confirme that which he cals a hainous doctrine? Is Mr. *Baxter* an adversary or an accessary to him whom he pronounceth the *Author* of this *wicked, intolerable, damnable doctrine?* Himself speaks more to confirm it than the person whom he opposeth. But how according to his principles, the terrors of our former bondage as he describes it, are in this life removed, neyther can I see, nor he make out without contradicting himselfe.

B. In the 180. page, *Hee denieth the plaine sense of the Text,* Mat. 10. 28.

Enough Magisterially if it were true what he objecteth, to say only and not to demonstrate the truth of what hee objecteth. But if false, who perceiveth not the censorious spirit of the Objector? That it is false appeareth evidently: for how doth hee deny the plain sense which denieth no sense at all of the Text, but onely declares what he thinks to bee the more principall scope of Christ in that Text, than other? And in this the context will evince that hee speaketh the truth.

B. In the 155. page, *He maketh this the difference betweene the two Covenants: One sayth, Doe this and live, the other sayth, Live and doe this: the one sayth, Doe this for life, the other sayth, Doe this from life.*

But I have proved fully that the Gospel saith also, Doe this for life.

I. Now hee manifesteth wherin the haynousnes of the doctrine

of this Book, and the intolerable damnable wickednes of the Author consisteth: *viz.* in his blindnes that hee did not foresee what Antichristian doctrine Mr. *Baxter* would afterward divulge to the world, and say hee had fully proved it: but for lacke of this foreknowledge, doth heer deliver the contrary truth of Christ prepossessing the minds of men therewith against Mr. *Baxters* future impostures.

But 2. Let him not say he hath fully proved, but let him fully prove that doing and works as the Scriptures doe oppose the same to faith and receiving of Christ, (in which sense this Author speaketh) are injoyned by the Gospel to justification of life, or the life of justification, and then let him expect that his Gospel shall stand, and the Gospel of Christ lie prostrate at his feet.

3. Because Mr. *Baxter* will never bee able to prove this, the true Disciples of Christ will still hold this as one principle difference between the two Covenants, that the one requires us to seeke life after the tenour of Justice, the other after the tenour of Grace. The one bids us to seeke it by Works, the other by Fayth. The one presupposeth the originall righteousnes given us in Adam, bidding us by it to follow after happines, the other offereth Christ unto us as the fountain of life both of Justification and Sanctification, calling upon us to receive or beleeve in him for both, that both may be ours when Christ is ours. *He is our life, and when Christ our life* (not works our life) *shall appear, we also shall appear with him in glory.* This is all that this Author meaneth in this passage, as himselfe makes evident. If in this he be an Hereticke, let mee live and die with him in his Heresie. To prevent mistake, I meane heere the Covenant of works in Mr. *Baxters* sense throughout this his Treatise, *viz.* the first Covenant made with Adam.

B. *So in his second part page* 190. *his great note to know the voyce of the Law by, is this, That when in Scripture there is any Morall worke commanded to bee done, either for the eschewing of punishment, or upon promise of any reward temporall or eternall, or else when any promise is made with the condition of any worke to bee done which is commanded in the Law, there is to bee understood the voyce of the Law.*

A notorious and dangerous mistake, which would

would make almost all the New Testament, and the very Sermons of Christ himselfe, to bee nothing but the Law of works. I have fully proved before, that Morall duties as part of our sincere obedience to Christ, are part of the condition of our salvation, and for it to be performed. And even Faith is a Morall duty. It is pity that any Christian should no better know the Law from the Gospel, especially one that pretendeth to discover it to others.

About the matter heer delivered by this Author, enough hath been spoken before, in examining what Mr. *Baxter* hath sayd in many parts of his Aphorisms contrary to it. Touching the proofe of the contrary Assertion, Mr. *Baxter* hath sayd no more than, nor so much as *Bellarmine* had sayd before him, and left prepared to his hand. Hee should therefore more properly have sayd, Not I, but *Bellarmine* hath fully proved. and therefore fully because Mr. *Baxter* so affirmeth. As to the Assertor of it, why doth hee pitch upon this Author alone, when *Calvin*, *Fulk*, Mr. *Fox*, (as I have before Chap. 15. alleadged and quoted them) Dr. *Amesius*, *Medul. Theol. lib.* 1. *cap.* 22. *Se.* 19. In a word all Protestant Divines from *Luther* till this present time, have in substance, and most of them that have occasion to pitch upon the same Subject, have even *tridem verbis*, delivered the same doctrine, (as to mercenary, or rewards of debt) having learned the same from the Apostle, why doth he single out this one as a singular man? Let him with *Bellarmine*, *Stapleton*, *Maldonat*, and the rest of that hair, roar out against all the Reformed Churches, *A notorious and dangerous mistake &c.* A herd of Hereticks and ignorant Animalls; *It is pity that any Christian should no better know the Law from the Gospel, especially such as pretend to discover it to others.*

As to his *Morall duties, and even Faith as a Morall duty to bee performed for salvation*; hee speaks like such morall men as nature now blinded and corrupted formeth, whose principle it is, *Naturam ut optimam ducem sequi*, to follow Nature and naturall instinct, or Reason as their best guide, knowing not spirituall things, because *the Naturall man cannot receive them*. If he favoured so much the Gospel as Philosophy, why doth not the phrase which Christ & his Apostles use [*of the spirit and spirituall things*] so much delight him as that of the Philosophers [*Morall and Moralities?*] As much

much was Christs offering himselfe a sacrifice and giving satisfaction to the Justice of God a Morall duty, and so not meritorious for us, because due to God from him by the Law for himselfe: as Faith in Christ and other purely Gospel duties subservient unto Faith. For both these duties on Christs and on our part are comprehended under this one generall of the Law of nature: *Whatsoever I shall command thee thou shalt do.* I shall leave the justification and salvation by *Morall Faith and Morall duties* to Mr. *Baxter* and with the Apostle, *through the Spirit wait for the hope of Righteousnesse by Faith.* Gal. 5. 5

B. *So in the next page.* 191. *he intolerably abuseth the Scripture in affirming that of* 2. Thes. 2. 12., *to be the voice of the Law, and so making Paul a Legall preacher.*

Is then every teacher, (after Mr. *Baxters* Canon) which declares what the voice, force, curse, and condemnation of the Law is, a Legall and Anti-Evangelicall preacher? So he affirmes Paull to bee if he speake out what the curse and condemnation of the Law is. Then not onely Paul, but Christ also and all his Apostles are Legall not Gospel preachers. For he will not deny them to have so made out the Law in its force &c. Or when the Apostle in that quoted Scripture speakes of their *Damnation which would not believe the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousnesse*, doth he not leave them under the damnation of the Law for not embracing the Gospell? doth not the Law hereby take occasion to damne them the more deeply for neglecting and rejecting the truth? The proper office of the Gospell is not to condemn but to save. Onely when its salvation is contemned it yeelds backe the contemners under the greater guilt to the Law to power out on them the larger, if not largest measure of its curse and wrath. *Do not thinke* (*saith our Saviour* to the Iewes that rejected his Gospell,) *that I will accuse you to the Father, there is one that accuseth you, even Moses in whom you trust.* Jo. 5. 45.

But whether the inference of making Paul a Legall Preacher, is to be ascribed to Mr *Baxter* or to the Author of the Marrow of Modern Divinity is easily discernible. That Author had onely sayd that one sentence of Paul in a whole Epistle was the voice of the Law. Mr. *Baxter* inferreth that so to say is to make Paul a Legall Preacher; & consequentially that to preach any thing of the Law makes a Legall Preacher. Let now Mr. *Baxter* name one Minister within this

this Nation that hath taught such ranke Antinomisme, as himselfe here that professeth himselfe an Antægonist to destroy it. But wee may perceive by this he will be all things, as well Antinomian as Arminian and Papist to smother the truth of the Gospell.

B. *And as shamefully doth he abuse* 1 Co. 6. 9.10. *as if the Apostle, when he biddeth them not to be deceived, were deceiving them himselfe in telling them; that no unrighteous person, fornicators, adulterers, &c. shall inherit the Kingdome of God. Is this Law? Then let me be a Preacher of the Law. If Paul be a Legalist then will I be a Legalist too. But these men know not that the Apostle speaketh of those that die such and that these sins exclude men the Kingdome as they are rebellions against Christ their Lord, and so a violation of the new Covenant.*

How extreamly is this man in love (*Narcissus* like) with his own beauty, or rather fancy? Every other Visage not begotten of his seed, and fashioned to his image is an Owle with him. The words of the Authour are these: [The Law saith], *knowest thou not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdome of God.* Be not deceived, &c. 1 Cor. 6. 9. *And therefore thou being a sinner and not righteous, shalt not inherit the Kingdome of God.* This is all that he hath against which Mr. *Baxter* raiseth his *bubub*, a shamefull abuse of the Scripture! Let him deny if hee can this to bee (though lesse principally and secondarily the voice of the Gospel, yet) primarily and more principally the voice of the Law. If not, then surely as he hath a Gospel, so also hath hee a Law of his owne making. Or what other ground is there why such shall not inherit the Kingdome, but because they are not in Christ? For whosoever is baptized with the bloud of Christ to justification, is baptized also with his spirit to sanctification. And if not in Christ, then under the Law. If under the Law, then under the curse and condemnation of the Law, and consequentially under the threat of the Law here denounced. Or what should hinder the Apostle from denouncing the curse of the Law against them that are and will be under the Law? Let Mr. *Baxter* have his will that the Gospel condemnes them for their finall unbeliefe and rebellion against Christ; yet doth not

not the Law condemne them too for all their unrighteousnes, fornications, Adulteries, &c. If he deny it, wee shall finde him the Author of a sweet peece of Gospel Doctrine: *That they which are in Christ are under the Curse of the Law*, (so hath hee before stoutly asserted) but they which are enemies of Christ, are exempted from it. If he confess it, then the shame returns upon himselfe which he layes on this Author.

B. *So in part.* 1. *pag.* 189. *hee mentioneth a Preacher that sayd, hee durst not exhort nor perswade sinners to believe their sinnes were pardoned, untill hee saw their lives reformed; for feare they should take more liberty to sinne. And hee censureth that Preacher to be ignorant in the Mystery of Faith.* [*And putting a false construction upon his words, he descanteth over him and insulteth against him for delivering an absurdity, in saying that which he said not.*]

Let him but add what followeth, & it wil appear there is no footing for him in these his words, for al the abusive carpings wherwith he seeks to disgrace him. *I thinke* (sayth the Author) *that Preacher was ignorant of the Mystery of Fayth, for it is of the Nature of sovereigne Waters, which so wash off the corruption of the Ulcer, that they coole the heat, and stay the spreading of the infection; and so by degrees heal the same: Neither did he know that it is the Nature of Cordials, so to comfort the heart and ease it, as to expell the noxious humours, and strengthen Nature against them.*

Is it not heere evident that the fayling which hee censureth in that Minister, is his mistake of the power and Nature of Spirituall and Gospel comforts, that hee dared not to speake a word of consolation to a wounded soule, before hee saw and had had proofe of his reformation, (though never so much burthened with the consideration of his sinne past, and gasping after Christ and forgivenes by him) for fear such spirituall comfort would carry him backe into carnall liberty againe. Nay, sayth this Author, The Mystery of Faith, or consolation which is by faith in Christ Jesus, is like sovereigne Waters and Cordialls, doth not onely comfort the wounded soule against the guilt, but also subdue the power, and stay the spreading of sinn, strengthening the soule against the future prevalency

prevalency of corruption: so that the due application and reception of it is the best furtherance, and not at all a hinderance to the reformation of the Life.

This doctrine may possibly offend Mr. *Baxters* palate, but I am sure it squares with the Gospel. All that Mr. *Baxter* hath therefore, pag. 104. 105. against the Authors words wrested into a wrong sense expresseth Mr. *Baxter* what hee is, but in no wise weakeneth the estimation of the Author with them that are wise. For he doth neyther explicitely nor implicitely affirme, that *justifying Faith is a beleeving that our sinnes are pardoned*, as Mr. *Baxter* untruly suggesteth, and thence draws matter of sugillation

He names the Mystery of Faith, which is one and the same as if he had sayd the Mystery of Christ, or the Mystery of the Gospel, all which in holy Writ, are equipollent terms. And what he affirms of this Mystery of Faith or Gospel, is that the deeper it sincks into the heart the more it purifies, sanctifies, and strengtheneth in the power of godlinesse. Mr. *Baxters* Anathema affixed to this Doctrine shall not hinder my [Amen] to it.

B. *Many other intolerable errours I could shew you in this booke: as his making the New Covenant to threaten nothing but present afflictions and losse of our present communion with God, pag. 208. And that we pray for no other kinds of Pardon. pag. 206. 210 Contrary to Mar. 16. 16. Heb. 10. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. Heb. 2. 3. Jo. 15. 2. 6. and many other places.*

He might more properly have sayd, *Many other intolerable slanders his candor and conscience could have incurred upon this booke.* For so his next words would have verified what hee had sayd; [*as his making the New Covenant to threaten nothing &c.*] When the Author in the quoted place speaketh nothing of the New Covenant, but of the Law of Christ, by which hee there declareth himselfe to meane the Ten Commandements, as they are now in the hand and disposing of Christ. And this Law he understands also in relation, not to the whole world, but to them that are implanted into Christ, his words being directed to *Neophytus*. To such (Christ having already borne the penalty of the Law in their stead)

temporall and fatherly chastisements onely for their purging and perfecting, are threatned in case through infirmity they transgresse the Law. In this, I conceive, hee alludeth to the priviledges of the Covenant made with David as the Type of Christ, and his seed as the Type of Christs seed, and so pertayning (as a Gospel liberty) no lesse fully to us than to them. *If his children forsake my Law, breake my statutes &c. Then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes; nevertheless my loving kindness will I not take utterly from him, nor suffer my faithfulnes to fail, my Covenant will I not break &c.* Ps 89.31-34. And this is M. *Brs.* own doctrine when he teacheth that there is no deathly violation of the new Covenant besides final unbelief & rebellion against Christ, in and under Thes. 32 33 34. and 37. But the Author whom Mr. *Br* calls heer *ad partes*, speaks not of finall unbeleefe or rebellion incident to the world, but of some particular transgression of any of the Ten Commandements (as hee expresseth himselfe) through the infirmity incident to the Saints. What fire and fury is there in this mans wrath, that having made an Adversary, will have him wounded, *vel per me*, though through his owne heart, *animam in vulnere ponit.* If it be an *intolerable errour* in this man, much more in Mr. *Baxter*, who much more vehemently and upon slighter and slenderer grounds asserts it.

The Scriptures which Mr. *Baxter* alleadgeth as contraried by this doctrine, speak eyther of such rebells, as when the Grace of Christ is offered them, persist in a finall refusall of it, or of such hypocrites as having once seemingly tasted it, Apostatize utterly from it. And with these this Author hath nothing heere to doe. Onely Mr. *Baxter* being heavily burthened with another Monster, which hee had a purpose to have disburthened himselfe of in a Tractate of Universall Redemption, being prevented by another, must needs now and then ease himselfe of it, and speake out how hatefull to him the doctrine of the certaine perseverance of the Saints in grace is.

The other things which hee hints and but hints at as errours in this Author, might bee taken into examination, if Mr. *Baxter* would alleadge his words, and shew what hee excepts against in them. I see not but the passages are pure and cleare enough in the Booke, if hee would forbeare the casting in of his salt-peire to corrupt them.

As

As he saith it was not his business to have objected, so neither was it my business to have defended, had hee not sought under a pretence of opposing this Booke, to defame many truths of Christ.

Chap. XI.

whether according to Mr. Baxter, *the Doctrine of Justification by Faith without works tend to carnall Liberty, and to the driving of Obedience out of the world.*

IN prosecuting his second Quere, Mr. *Baxter* hath lead us a long race. In the rest he is more straight and short.

A third Quere which bears the force of another Argument to subvert Justification by Faith without works, hee so proposeth as containing another absurdity and evill likely to follow upon this doctrine: His words are as followeth:

B. Aphor. pa. 325. *Whether this Doctrine doth not tend to drive obedience out of the World? For if men doe once beleeve that it is not so much as a part of the Condition of their Justification, will it not much tend to relax their diligence? I know that Love and thankfulnesse should bee enough; and so it will when all our ends are attained in our ultimate end: Then wee shall Act for these ends no more: wee shall have nothing to do, but love, and joy, and prayse, and bee thankfull: But that is not yet. Sure as God hath given us the affections of Feare, Desire, Hope, and Care; so he would have us use them for the attainment of our great ends. Therefore he that takes down but one of all our motives to obedience, he helps to destroy obedience it selfe; seeing we have need of every Motive that God hath left us.*

I shall examine heere first the Quere it selfe; then the amplification of it. The Quere or Interrogation bears the force of a strong Affirmation, That the doctrine of Justification by Grace without Works doth tend to drive obedience out of the world, and to relax mens diligence to good works. It must bee therefore a prodigious doctrine that produceth so cursed an effect.

First then I demand whom he censureth as the Authors of so direfull an evill, God or men? If the Holy Ghost hath not taught men this doctrine, let the guilt of this evill bee upon such men as have entertayned it. But the Holy Ghost hath taught it. *To him that worketh not but beleeveth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his Faith is imputed to him for righteousnesse.* *But hee that worketh*, or brings works to be justified by them, *is excluded*, Ro. 4. 4. 5. *Even as blessednes to whom God imputeth Righteousnes without works*, ver. 6. *Not of works but of him that calleth*, Ro. 9 11. *If of works then not by Grace, if by Grace then not of works*, Ro. 11. 7. *By Grace through Faith not of works*, Eph. 2. 8. 9. *Not our owne righteousnes*

but the righteousnesse which is by the Faith of Christ, Phil. 3. 9. *Not by works of righteousnesse which wee have done, but according to his mercy*. And many more testimonies before in a fitter place alleadged, all in one harmony evincing the Holy Ghost to bee the Author of this Doctrine. So that Mr. *Baxter* loadeth not man but God with this reproach, of seeking to drive obedience out of the world.

2. Whether hee hath not taken up this slander from the Monks and Jesuits? Whether there bee any of them that having written against Justification by Faith, which hath not aspersed it and our Churches that hold it, with this scandall? Or any one of the Protestant Divines which hath defended this Article of our Faith, but hath spoken fully to the vindicating of this Doctrine from this so injurious a slander? When Mr. *Baxter* is so much Popish that hee takes up every most frothy Objection of every shaveling of that side to adore it; and so much an Anti-Protestant that hee scorns to mention what on our part hath beene regested in way of answer to it: why takes he up his habitation among Protestants but to corrupt and seduce them?

3. If hee meane by the World the unbeleevers of the World, that are strangers to Christ and the Covenant of Promise, how can it bee sayd properly, this Doctrine tends to drive out obedience from the World? Can it drive out of the World that which is not in it? Had he sayd, it tends to drive out the Formality, and outside Morality, and base Hypocrisie from the World, wee might have considered of it. But to tell of driving out obedience, that which God accepteth and alloweth as true Obedience, from such as would never bee drawne to it, implies a kinde of contradiction.

4. If hee meane Spirituall and Gospel Obedience, the obedience of Faith, which consisteth in the denial of our owne righteousnesse, and our owne strength, and cleaving to Christ alone, for Justification and Sanctification; and that this Doctrine doth (not drive it out of the World, but) hinder the World from partaking of it: how doth the Wisedome of Christ, and the Wisdome of Mr. *Baxter* herein dash eyther against other? *God so lo-*

ved

ved the world (saith Christ) *that hee gave his onely begotten Sonne, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have life everlasting*, Jo. 3. 16. *He that believeth in mee, out of his belly shall flow Rivers of living water*, Jo. 7. 38. *If I bee lifted up from the Earth I will draw all men to me*, Jo. 12. 32. *Come unto me all that are weary and heavy layden, and I will refresh you*, Mat. 11. 28. *Goe preach the Gospel to every Creature, hee that believeth shall be saved*, Mark. 16. 15, 16. *This is a faithfull saying*, &c. *that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief.* 1 Tim. 1 15. *They that receive abundance of Grace, and the Gift of Righteousnesse, shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ*: and hundreds more the like Scriptures, in which the fulnesse of grace and righteousnesse offered to the world to the chiefe sinners of the world freely to be given to as many as will receive and believe in Christ; is made an attractive to obedience, and not (as Mr. *Baxter* slandereth this Doctrine) a hinderance to it.

5. If there be any of the world that are so offended at this Doctrine, as to make it a stone of stumbling to them, and an hinderance to the obedience of faith; they are the worst people of the world, Jewes, or of a Jewish spirit, Scribes and Pharisees hypocrites, who having *made cleane the outside of the cup and platter, (though the inside be unpurged from its guilt) think themselves the alone holy and righteous persons, will not enter into the Kingdome of Grace, unlesse their owne worth and righteousnesse shall usher them into it, and the Publicans and Harlots bee barr'd out as unworthy: rend their cloaths and cast dust in the aire like mad-men, if mention bee made of admitting with them the uncleane Gentiles*, Acts 22. 21, 23. *If the Prodigall sonne be entertained, refuse in great wrath any more to meddle in their Fathers house and service*, Luke 15. 28, 30. *And will not hearken though earnestly entreated: These many years have I served and never transgressed, and shall now this companion of harlots be here with mee? and these last that came in at evening but made equall with us that have borne the burthen and heat of the day?* Mat. 20. 12. *They had their owne Farmes, Oxen, Wives, Therefore as happy enough at home they would not come to partake of the Lords Feast, but left it to the poore, blinde, and lame*, &c. But against such the Lord hath *sworne that they should not taste of his supper*, Luke 14. and the misery of this doome wee see lying heavy upon that Nation to this day.

day. Is it not enough to Mr. *Baxter* that hee hath not himselfe taken heed of this Leaven of theirs, but that hee must seeke to sowre us with it too, that we might incurre the like vengeance?

6. If there bee such as turne this Doctrine into licentiousnes, that because good works are not appointed of God to be the condition of their justification, will therefore relax their diligence, the fault is not in the Doctrine, but in the corruption of their hearts. They ought to conclude from Grace to duty, and not to carnall liberty: If they do otherwise, it is not because they have, but because they have not effectually drank into themselves this Doctrine. Else if all the means of Grace which carnall men abuse should bee guilty of their abuse, then the death of Christ, and preaching of the Gospel must be anathematized, because he is laid as a *stone at which some will stumble*, and *as well for the fall as the rising of many in Israel*, and *that is to some the savour of death, as well as to others the savour of life*. The children must not lose their bread, for feare the doggs should catch after it to satisfie their rapine. The Apostle had delivered a sacred doctrine of Gospell truth, *Where sinne abounded, Grace abounded much more*, Ro. 5. 20. Hee seeth easily this doctrine would be abused by sensualists, therefore annexeth an Objection, *Shall we continue in sinne that Grace may abound?* Ro. 6. 1. This use some might make of it. Doth hee therefore recall his doctrine? Nothing lesse. Better many wretches to wantonize to their ruine, than one soule for which Christ hath died, lose such a prop of consolation.

7. The truly beleeving saints cannot so reason or abuse the grace of God, or relax their obedience; as for other reasons so specially for those alleadged by the Apostle, in the following part of that 6. Chapter to the Romans.

8. Wee doe not by the Preaching of this Doctrine open a door to prophanenesse, but following the guidance of the Scripture, make use of it as the strongest obligation to obedience: as in Answer to the next of Mr. *Baxters* Queres shall be manifested.

Laſtly, Mr. *Baxters* Doctrine of juſtification by Works, is guilty of as many other crimes, ſo of this alſo wherewith hee chargeth ours.

1. By inſtilling into men a ſuppoſition of a poſſibility and neceſſity of attayning ſuch a righteouſneſs of their owne, and worthineſs of their works, by the worth and merit whereof, they may deſerve Chriſt and juſtification by him. The ſelfe-righteous Juſticiaries will greedily ſwallow downe this bait, and then little regard the obedience of faith: Will not come in to Chriſt but upon their owne Terms and Articles. For the whole need not the Phyſitian but the ſicke. Proofe enough heereof we have in the Scribes and Phariſees, who if they might not be admitted as the only ſons of God, wholly rejected the Kingdome of God. The very Publicanes and Harlots entring before them. Such pride is there naturally in mans heart, that if they have any thing of their owne, faire though but in appearance, they thinke the Goſpel of Chriſt more credited by their profeſſion of it, than themſelves benefited by it.

2. By blunting the edge of mens deſires after Chriſt, If it muſt be their owne works and righteouſneſs that muſt mediate their intereſt in Chriſt and juſtification by him, deſpaire of attainment ſtrikes them dead from further labouring and moving to this end. For what rigteouſneſs, what works, can bee ſufficient to ſuch an atchievement? So obedience to the Faith is nipt in the very budde, where there is a ſenſe and conviction of a mans naughtineſs and nothingneſs.

3. By taking off the ſpirits of a Chriſtians love, joy, and alacrity, in beleeving and ſerving, when a humble and ſelfe-denying ſoul is once choaked with Mr. *Baxters* Doctrine, that all the benefit which he hath or can have by Chriſt, is to be only a probationer for juſtification and life, even to his dying day; that till then hee is but conditionally pardoned and conditionally adopted; that Gods love to him may be anon turned into hatred, his ſinnes againe imputed, and himſelfe hurried into hell: That his ſafety ſtill depends upon his own works & righteouſnes, no peny, & no *Pater noſter*: that the grace of God is let to farme for fine and rent; no one promiſe of the word in all this his Booke being alledged by Mr. *Bax-*

ter

ter (which I can remember) of any support which the beleever shall receive from God in the state of Grace, but all, Selfe doe, and selfe have: This Doctrine eyther benummeth and freezeth up all a poore Christians love and delight in serving God, emasculating his spirits to obedience: or reduceth him under a yoke of bondage, making him to worke possibly but in feare, not of love; as under the rod, or rather in the fire, fearing death and hell all his life time. And whether this bee (saving in Mr. *Baxters* accompt) obedience, or disobedience, let them that are spirituall judge.

4. By turning the very obedience of his Disciples into disobedience and rebellion. The best works done to be justified by them, and for them, are the greatest abhomination in Gods accompt, his Grace and Salvation are either denied or refused when wee bring works to appropriate it to us, Rom. 4. 4, 5. what is righteousnesse in its matter, is sin in its end. Therefore shall wee finde still that whosoever are admitted to, those that seek to ingratiate themselves by their good works though done in Christs name, are hurled off from Christ. *I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.* I *know you not, depart from mee yee workers of iniquity. More joy for one sinner that repenteth, than for ninety nine just persons that need no repentance.*

For a more full and satisfactory answer to the Argument contained in this Quere, I leave the Reader to the perusing of the Protestant Divines that have written upon this Subject, and abundantly refuted this calumny of the Papists: what I have here said is rather an addition to them, then a full answer to the Quere, which I leave to be fetcht from them.

What he speakes in the Amplification of this Quere, needeth no large examination. First, he grants, *That love and thankfulnes should be enough,* [to hold us to obedience and duty] *and will bee so when all our ends are attained in our ultimate end: then wee shall act for these ends no more,* &c. How untowardly doth this passage, and and another passage of the former Quere hang together? what he pronounceth here, that love and thankfulnesse should be enough to hold us to duty, without doing for justification and salvation, and that which here should be, and hereafter shall be our perfection,

the ſame he affirmes there, if practiced, *will undoubtedly damne the Practicer.* So according to Mr. *Baxter*, if a Chriſtian endeavour ſincerely to do what *he ſhould*, and to come as neere in this life as it is poſſible, to the perfection which he ſhall enjoy in the future, hee ſhall undoubtedly bee damned for it. Who then goes about to drive obedience out of the world? he, or they whom he oppoſeth?

What uſe is to be made of the affections of feare, deſire, hope, and care, to the attainment of our great ends, hath been enough diſcuſſed in the examination of the former Quere, and would be a meere Tautologȳ here to do it againe.

Let it be proved once that God hath left Juſtification by workes to be a motive to obedience, it ſhall be granted to bee a help to the deſtroying of Obedience, to take downe this one Motive. But if contrariwiſe Juſtification of ſinners by Works, and Morall Obedience bee erected not by God, but by the Devill, Mr. *Baxters* neither Sophiſtry, nor Oratory ſhall induce us to leane upon the Devils crutch, both to the forfeiting of our Juſtification, and turning our Obedience into ſin.

CHAP.

Chap. XII.

whether the doctrine of justification by Faith without workes be a soul-cozening doctrine? or harden the people in a soul-cozening Faith? what the doctrine of Faith which the Protestant Churches holde, is? and how farr from deserving this Calumny? with something about the facility or difficulty to perswade the multitude to such a Faith.

His fourth Quere by which as by another Argument he goeth about to make odious and to destroy justification by Faith without works, runs thus:

B. pag. 326. *Doth it not much confirme the world in their soul-cozening Faith? surely that Faith which is by many thought to justifie, is it that our people doe almost easily embrace, that is the receiving of Christ for their Saviour, and expecting pardon and salvation by him, but not withall receiving him for their Lord and King, nor delivering up themselves to be ruled by him. I meet not with one but is resolved in such a Faith, till it be overthrowne by teaching them better. They would all trust Christ for the saving of their soules, and that without dissembling, for ought any man can discerne: Are all these men justified? &c.*

A Chip of the same blocke with the former, in the use of it Mr. *Baxter* as he hath learned of them from whom he hath received it, levels against the very heart of Christ and his Gospell. Had hee said with Iames *that to say we have Faith and not to have workes*, is to cozen our souls, I should have said with him. But in that he speaketh not of a soul-cozening profession of Faith, but layeth so horrid an imputation upon Faith it selfe, this gives us cause to examine what Faith he meaneth, that we may be able to discern whether that Faith, or else Mr. *Baxter* by defaming it, goe about to cozen our souls, and so embrace the true friend and reject the Cheater.

This cozening Faith, according to Mr. *Baxter*, must needs bee that which squareth not in its nature and manner of justification

with the justifying Faith. *viz.* that Gospell Faith which (neither as a deed and worke, as a worke of Morall duty, and worke of our owne righteousnesse, of our perfect and meritorious righteousnesse, doth begin and but begin to inright us to Christ and Justification by him, leaving to eyther vertues and works to perfect it: but) as an instrument ordeyned and given us of God, by which we receive Christ alone offering up himselfe a sacrifice for us to bee our whole righteousnes to justification, and that without works and in opposition to works.

That this is Pauls doctrine and Pauls justifying Faith, I suppose hath beene enough evinced before: and shall (God assisting) bee more fully cleared in its due place, when I come to examine the reasons which Mr. *Baxter* bringeth to proove his doctrine not to bee opposite to Paul's, but the same with it. Therefore in calling this Faith a soule couzening Faith, hee proclaimes Paul, (yea Christ himselfe, which revealed to Paul his Gospel) a cheater and couzener: learning this calumniation from that Jewish and Pharisaicall generation from which he hath derived his Doctrine. Joh. 7. 12. But the testimony of the Holy Ghost runnes contrary to Mr. *Baxters* pronouncing them that joyne Works with Faith as necessary concauses with it to Justification, to bee the couzeners, troublers, and subverters of mens soules. Col. 2. 4. Gal. 5. 12. Act. 15. 1. 24.

But to vindicate the Doctrine of the Protestant Churches (and therein also the doctrine of the Gospel, both being one, and one both;) from having any thing in it that may give footing to this calumny, that we teach a soule-couzening Faith: and to manifest that Mr. *Baxter* doth knowingly asperse the Doctrine of Faith, and them that hold it with this slander: I shall collect into a few heads the doctrine which our Churches teach, yea which Mr. *Baxter* knoweth they teach, as to this Question.

First then they affirme, That God hath layd up in one Christ alone all supplies for poore sinners to relieve them against all their spiritual wants: of which supplies these 2 are principal ones, righteousnesse to justification, and the Spirit to sanctification. The one delivereth from guilt and condemnation; the other from the domination of sin and impotency to acceptable obedience. The former stateth the sinner *Reatum in Curia*, righteous before God a gaine, having his sin pardoned and no more imputed: the latter spi-

rituallizeth

ritually zeth, quickneth, and new formeth him again to the will and image of God in holineſſe and righteouſneſſe.

2 That whoſoever receiveth one receiveth both theſe ſupplies from Chriſt, none puts him on to juſtification, but puts him on to ſanctification alſo: and ſo becomes a new creature as well in reality as in relation: becomes inherently as well as imputatively righteous by him.

3 That it is one and the ſame Faith which is inſtrumentall both to juſtification and ſanctification, though not by one and the ſame but by ſeverall and different Acts. As my hand even the ſame hand is inſtrumentall both to feed and cloth me, though not by the ſame but by different Acts. It is the will of my benefactor (to hold my ſelfe to Mr. *Baxters* ſimily) having ranſommed me from Turkiſh thraldome and appointed me to honourable ſervice in his houſe, to leave open to me both his wardrop and his ſtore-houſe or promptuary of proviſions, with a command that I ſhould pertake freely and richly of both; that by the one I might be fitly habited and adorned, by the other nouriſhed and ſtrengthened for honorable ſervice to be done to him. In both theſe my hand is inſtrumentall to ſerve and furniſh me, yet by ſeverall Acts. It neither fetcheth meat from his wardrop nor clothing from his Pantry and Cellar, but by ſeveral Acts from both and either, what in both and either is laid up for me; yet ſo as all is my Lords goods, and by my pertaking thereof I am put into a capacity of doing him faithfull and acceptable ſervice. I need not make the application, every one can do it for himſelfe. The eternall King having layd downe the life of his owne ſon for the ranſom of my ſoule, hath opened to me all his treaſuries in one & the ſame Chriſt, the treaſury of his blood & merits to purge me from the guilt of ſin, and obligation to judgement and vengeance, ſo that having put on Chriſt crucified my Law is done, my ſin forgiven, my nakedneſſe and filthineſſe covered, and I ſtand in Chriſt as perfectly righteous as if I had never offended: the treaſury of his ſpirit and ſpirituall gifts, ſufficient to turn my water into wine, to renew my hart, and to ſanctifie me throughout, that henceforth I ſhall hate ſinn no leſſe than hell, and delight in the Law of God after the inner man, taking no leſſe pleaſure in the holineſſe than in the happineſſe which are by Chriſt. The eternall Father offers both together, and neither without the other. And the ſame ſpirit which drawes to one drawes to both. The ſame Faith which apprehends one apprehends both, is not a juſtifying except it be alſo

a

a ſanctifying Faith. Yet by ſeverall Acts and from ſeverall treaſuries in the ſame Chriſt, the ſame Faith fetcheth juſtification from his ſatisfaction and new inherent righteouſneſſe from the ſpirit of ſanctification.

4 That as juſtification ought and doth declare it ſelfe to the perſon juſtified by its proper and immediate fruits, peace of conſcience, joy in the Holy Ghoſt, prizing Chriſt above all things, ſoul contentation in him, living and dwelling upon him, ſelling all to enjoy him alone to righteouſneſſe and ſalvation, counting all things dung and loſſe in compariſon of him, emptying our ſelves more and more of our owne righteouſneſſe, of our owne-ſelfe confidence, that hee may be made our all at Gods Tribunall; repairing no more to Abanah, Pharfar, no nor to Jordan it ſelfe, but to the one fountaine of Chriſts blood, there to Waſh dayly and be cleane; neither in this mountain nor yet at Hieruſalem, but in Chriſt alone to worſhip that we may be accepted: So alſo ſanctification doth and ought to ſhew it ſelfe to us and others by its fruits; to our ſelves by the ſeeds and habits of love, righteouſneſſe, holineſſe &c. affecting the heart within: To others by the fruits and workes of the ſpirit manifeſted in the practiſe without, *viz.* all the Acts of love, mercy, goodneſſe, ſanctity, piety, charity, equity, patience, meekneſſe, &c. as alſo in ſubduing the fleſh by the ſpirit, mortifying every evill affection, fighting againſt every ſinn; that we may ſhew our ſelves *a peculiar people of the Lord, zealous of every good worke.*

5 That juſtification and ſanctification by Faith in Chriſt do evidence either the other. He that can finde himſelfe truely juſtified may know himſelfe to be no leſſe truly ſanctified by Chriſt, becauſe he that is in union with Chriſt ſo as to be partaker of his juſtifying and ſaving righteouſneſſe, by being ſo joyned to Chriſt is become one ſpirit with him, ſaith the Apoſtle. The ſpirit of ſanctification diſcendeth and giveth influence from the head to the whole body and every member thereof. So on the other ſide, he that by being one ſpirit is ſanctified by the ſame ſpirit of Chriſt, may by this evidence know himſelfe that Chriſt by the ſame ſpirit is made righteouſneſſe to him, and is in the ſame relation to God with Chriſt being juſtified, adopted, &c. a ſon and heir with him to all the inheritance. Sanctification (I ſay) truly underſtood is ſuch an evidence, (for none are ſanctified but the juſtified, and all the juſtified by Faith are ſanctified) if it be ſanctification indeede, it may be made an evidence of juſtification.

6. Yet

6 Yet neither all seeming peace and quietnesse of conscience, or joy in expectation of salvation, or hope that is made the ground of this joy, and such other like seeming effects of Justification are alway sure evidences to a man that he is justified; because not alway fruits or parts of sanctification, they may proceed from another and baser principle, *viz.* from the deceitfulnesse of their heart, or self-love, and self-advancing, or from the spirit of slumber upon the conscience, or from ignorance of Gods way and method of bringing many Children to glory: Nor are all seeming holiness, honesty, meeknesse, temperance, patience, and other like vertues, either in their habite, as they really affect the heart, or in their act, as they are with an ardent zeale for God, brought forth into practice; sure evidences of sanctification by Christ: because these also may proceed from other and baser principles, and not from the Spirit of Christ, as from the abiding prints of the Law of Nature written in the heart, or from the power and suggestions of a convinced and awaked conscience, or from strong impressions made into the soule by a morall aud vertuous education, or other like sub-celestiall, and unspirituall principles. So that our certaine and known union to Christ, and our justification and sanctification sensibly thence flowing, may be properly and unfailingly made our sound evidence of the spirituall life and acceptablenesse of our vertues and works: But these in themselves in no wise certaine evidences and demonstrations to us of our justification and sanctification by Christ. Sanctification is one thing, and a zealous endeavour to be in all things conformed to the will of God, is or may be another. The former is only from the Spirit of Christ, and wrought only in them which are in Christ. The later may proceed from morall principles, and is incident even to them also that are aliens from Christ.

7 Nevertheless, even these vertues and good works do so farr evidence, that from the Negation of these, a man is certainely denyed to be in Christ, or to be justified or sanctified by the faith of Christ. I mean that whosoever can allow himself in the habituall practice of any known sin, or rejection of any known duty, that man may know himself, and be known of others to be an Alien from Christ. Because *whosoever is in Christ, is a new Creature, all things are become new*; not only in respect of his relation, but of his manners and conversation also; and in whomsoever the Spirit of Sanctification dwelleth, it dwels in a state of reign, not of bondage.

Withall, these vertues and good works, when they are found to flow from our union to Christ, and the love of God shed abroad in our hearts through Christ: and upon examination a man can truly say, that he hath ceased to hew from any other Quarrie, or to dip from any other Fountain than from Christ, that from his Spirit alone hee daily sucketh life, as the branch from the root to bring forth fruit, and from the sacrifice of Christs death a sweet odour to make himself and his fruit acceptable, then they serve as good seconds to prove to his soul that he is justified and sanctified: But so that his being in Christ must first prove his fruit to be good, before his fruit can have any power to evidence him to be in Christ, and the evidence of both his justification and sanctification consisteth not so much in the qualifications which he hath attained, or works which he doth and hath done, as in his continuall waiting upon Chrih, from him alone to receive what hee ought to be and to do in all wel-pleasing before God, and the love of God in Christ enabling to obedience.

8 That although Sanctification and the fruits thereof do each in its own degree (as aforesaid) more or lesse evidence our Justification, yet have they no concausality with Faith to the producing of it. All that are in Christ, are Saints in Christ, yet their sanctity goes not before their being in Christ, but is an immediate fruit thereof. The forgivenes of sin and Adoption doth in order go before their doing of acceptable service to God, and unacceptable service cannot justifie.

9 *The grace of God which bringeth salvation* [*and justification*] *teacheth men to deny ungodlinesse*, &c. *and to live soberly*, &c. Cals upon all to stretch forth their Faith to apprehend to themselves in Christ both the imputed and the inherent righteousnes: so far is it from breathing a soul-cozening or a soul-corrupting faith. Therefore is the justifying Faith called by the Holy Ghost *a most holy Faith*, Jude 20. *A* [*soule*] *purifying Faith*, Act. 15. 9. *A sanctifying Faith*, Act. 26. 18. Implying its efficacy as well to sanctifie as to justifie, and that there is no true sanctification but that which is instrumentally obtained, or at least received by Faith.

Lastly, that one chief end of our Justification is, that we bring forth acceptable fruit to God here inchoate, hereafter in perfect obedience to God, and conformity with him: And the Justifier doth and will attain his end in justifying; therefore brings none to glory, but such as have all vertues and good works at least in their root

root and ſeed while they are here; and if after their effectuall calling they live to have time and opportunity, do not unfeignedly endeavour univerſally to declare the ſame in their practice. So that to dream of any glorified man in heaven, that was not actually a Saint upon earth, is a dream from hell, not from heaven.

All theſe things might have been largely proved both from the Scriptures and our Proteſtant Writers; but that I eſteem them all to be ſo known to be the conſenting aſſerteons of all our Churches, and by them ſo fully confirmed by the word, that I ſhould but abuſe time to take it up in particularizing what is in this Caſe ſo generally written and read.

I have been the more large in expreſſing the doctrine of the Proteſtant Churches upon this Argument, to wipe off the ſtain which Mr. *Br.* hath learned of the Papiſts to lay upon it in this and the former quere, which are wholly framed to beguile the weaker ſort, having nothing in them to ſtagger the Judicious. And now I leave it both to the ſtrong and weak to judge, whether the Accuſer of the Brethren [himſelf] can poſſibly expreſſe more impudence and falſhood in ſlandering the Churches of Chriſt than this man hath done? or if he had not bound himſelf to ſpeak after the Jeſuits and Monks whatſoever they traducingly ſay, whether there be any colour of reaſon for him to have layd upon us theſe two accuſations? To hold my ſelf to that which I am now examining, what is there in this Faith and Doctrine thereof, which I have deſcribed, deſerving to be called a ſoul-cozening Faith? And when he addeth, *That Faith which is by many thought to juſtifie* (his meaning is, which all the Proteſtant Churches and Divines teach) and which *our people doe all moſt eaſily embrace, is the receiving of Chriſt for their Saviour, and expecting pardon and ſalvation by him, but not withall receiving him for their Lord and King, nor delivering up themſelves to be ruled by him.* Let him now name that one Church, or one Theologiſt in any one of the Proteſtant Churches that hath ſo taught, and divided the receiving of Chriſt, as Lord and King, from receiving him as Saviour and pardoner, in juſtifying Faith: or els confeſs that he hath drunk deeply into the Jeſuits prenciples, that all equivocations, frauds, lyes, ſlanders, and whatſoever is worſe than theſe, are all not only lawfull, but alſo meritorious, when practiced for the advancement of the Triple Crown, and the Holy Mother-Church of Rome. We do indeed divide works from Faith, and baniſh them from having any

concauſality with it in juſtifying: But let Mr. *Br.* produce one that hath divided Chriſt the King from Chriſt the Saviour, or denyed him in either Title to be the object of juſtifying Faith: or any one that hath taught that to be a juſtifying Faith, which expecteth ſalvation from Chriſt, but will not deliver up the ſoul to be ruled by him. I chalenge Mr. *Br.* to vindicate herein his reputation, and to manifeſt that he followeth the dictates of Naturall conſcience at leaſt, and not of wilful malice againſt the truth, by naming one that hath taught any ſuch thing. The Proteſtant Churches and Writers are ſo cleer herein, that they do not divide from juſtifying Faith, the very Aſſent that there is a God, that hee made the world, that he drowned it, and repair'd it; that Chriſt was the Son of the Virgin *Mary*, that hee was born at *Bethlehem*, circumciſed at eight days old, diſputed among the Doctors, turned water into wine, and did many miracles, or whatſoever els the Scriptures in the leaſt things affirme to be true. All this the juſtifying Faith aſſents to, neither can it not aſſent to every truth of the word; yet it ſo aſſents, not as juſtifying. In this act it knows nothing but Chriſt and him crucified. Much leſſe do they ſo divide, as Mr. *B.* here againſt knowledg and conſcience objecteth. They ſo far ſhew themſelves abhorrent from it, that they utterly deny any to come to the Kingdom of glory, but through Chriſts Kingdom of grace.

But the Doctrine it ſelf wch here he reneweth about the object of Faith, Chriſt as our Lord as well as our Saviour, I have examined before in anſwer to his fourth Argument. Thither I ſend the Reader for ſatisfaction what the Proteſtants hold, and upon what grounds, here it is beſides the matter to fall into a new diſpute about it.

It ſhall ſuffice here only to examine the new Argument which he brings to prove, that the Doctrine which holds forth juſtification by Faith, is a ſoul-cozening; but that which teacheth juſtification by works, is a ſoul-ſaving doctrine. For this is his meaning in what he diſputeth here of Chriſt the Saviour, and Chriſt the Lord made the object of juſtifying Faith, as hee hath largely explayned himſelf before: And if hee mean not ſo, all that he here ſayth is but a hunting after Graſhoppers in the ſnow to fight with them: For none is there to be found oppoſing what he ſayth in the words and phraſe he uſeth. But himſelf is a ſure Interpreter of himſelfe, and we muſt take him as himſelf hath explayned his meaning.

meaning. And then his Argument is drawn from the eaſineſſe or difficulty of receiving the one or the other Doctrine. It muſt be a ſoul-cozening doctrine, which all are eaſily perſwaded to be cozened with. Thus wee find him expreſſing himſelf in that part of the Query which is before tranſcribed. Our people (ſaith he) do all moſt eaſily embrace it; I meet with no one but is reſolved in ſuch a faith, till it be overthrown by teaching them better. They would all truſt Chriſt for the ſaving of their ſouls, &c. And in the following part of the Querie.

> B. *Let any Miniſter but try his ungodly people, whether they will not all be perſwaded very eaſily to believe that Chriſt will pardon and ſave them, &c. But whether it be not the hardeſt thing in the world to perſwade them really to take him for their Lord, and his word for their Law, and to endeavour faithfull obedience accordingly? Surely the eaſineſſe of the former, and difficulty of the later, ſeemeth to tell us, that it is a ſpirituall, excellent, neceſſary part of juſtifying Faith, to accept unfeignedly Chriſt for our Governour, and that part which the world among us will moſt hardly yeeld to, and therefore hath more need to be preached than the other.*

Were he a true *Iſraelite in whom there is no guile*, which ſpeaketh, all this might be granted him. But becauſe he hath fully declared, that he meaneth by receiving Chriſt for our Saviour, juſtification by Faith in Chriſt the Redeemer, and by receiving him for our Lord and Governour, juſtification by works, nothing can be ſafely granted to him. The whole ſumm of his Argumentation amounts to this ſyllogiſm:

That doctrine of Juſtification which the multitude doth eaſily embrace, is a ſoul-cozening doctrine: but that which they are not without much difficulty perſwaded to receive, is a ſoul-ſaving doctrine.

But the multitude eaſily embraceth Juſtification by Faith alone, and not without difficulty Juſtification by works:

Ergo the former is a ſoul-cozening, the latter a ſoul-ſaving doctrine.

He muſt acknowledge that he thus argueth, or argueth nothing, or nothing to the queſtion. To the Propoſition I diſtinguiſh firſt about the meaning of the terms: And firſt about the word *embracing*,

cing or *receiving*, betwixt a vitall or effectuall, and a meerly hiſtoricall embracing, betwixt a reall receiving, and an aſſent of the judgment that the thing is to be received: or more plainly, beleeving, and a mans ſaying he doth beleeve, or his profeſſion of Faith. 2 Between that which is eaſie or difficult in it ſelf, or to mans naturall ability: and that which God makes eaſie by the concurrence, or leaves difficult by the with-holding of his grace.

Having thus diſtinguiſhed, in whatſoever ſenſe he takes the Terms, I deny both Conſequents of the Propoſition. For if he mean onely an externall aſſent to the verity and goodneſs of the doctrine, All men which have reaſon in their underſtandings, and freedom in their wills, do with the like facility chooſe that which is made out to them to be good, and refuſe that which is made out to them to be evill. Or if he mean a vitall and effectuall embracing, the doctrine of Juſtification is alike difficult to all that are of the carnall multitude. It is a ſpirituall doctrine, and the naturall man receiveth not, cannot receive ſpirituall things, 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. Again if he mean an eaſines and difficulty in it ſelf and to mans naturall ability, The true doctrine of Juſtification is alike difficult, yea unpoſſible to all effectually to receive. *None can come to the Son except the Father draw him*, Jo. 6. 44. But if he mean a facility and eaſines of receiving by means of the concurrence of Gods grace making it eaſy, then is it alike eaſy to all men that are holpen alike by Gods grace; and alike difficult, yea unpoſſible to all that are left deſtitute of it. So that the eaſines or difficulty of perſwading the multitude to entertain this or that doctrine of Juſtification, can be no ſure rule of concluding either doctrine to conzen, or to ſave the ſoul.

Beſides I deny the aſſumption in the whole and in both its parts. For how can that which is a ſupernaturall doctrine be eaſily received by naturall men, the whole ſtream of whoſe wiſedom and will is againſt it: ſuch as is Juſtification by Faith in the redeemed? or that which is a naturall doctrine dictated by naturall reaſon and conſcience, (I mean a doctrine of naturall right) be ſo excedent in difficulty to receive: ſuch as is Juſtification by works?

Mr. *Br* flies here to Experience to apologize for him. *Try* (ſaith he) *the ungodly people, whether all would not, whether there be a man to be found that will not eaſily be perſwaded to beleeve that Chriſt will pardon and ſave them: But whether it be not the hardeſt thing in the world to perſwade them to take Chriſt for their Lord, and to yeeld obedience accordingly,*

cordingly, &c. Not to except here againſt his words in which he putteth a believing that Chriſt will pardon and ſave, for a juſtifying Faith: (though when he doth but dream he hath taken that advantage againſt another, as wee have ſeen, he inſults over him as over a mock-man or puppet, and can hardly abſtain from toſſing him in a blanket:) Nor againſt the ill diſpoſing of the parts of the Antitheſis, glancing lightly over that which he would blow off into a vapour, but giving its full weight and power to that which he will have to ſtand: I ſhall take his words in that ſenſe in which he would be underſtood by as many as he hath a hope to beguile. And thus to his direction, try whether all do not profeſs their Faith in Chriſt the Saviour, that they truſt and will truſt in his merits alone for ſalvation and pardon: I anſwer, Try the ungodly multitude whether they do not every Mothers Child profeſs that they embrace Chriſt for their Lord, and that they do and will yeeld obedience to him to their dying day, as well as God ſhall give them grace?

Object. But they ſay and do not, profeſſe but yield not actually this obedience.

Anſw. So the former alſo ſay and do not, profeſs a full reliance upon and receiving of Chriſt for righteouſneſs, but perform it not. For if they ſo received Chriſt, they ſhould have Rivers of living water flowing out of them, *Jo.* 7. 38. of carnall ſhould become ſpirituall, and of unclean, holy.

Nay if experience muſt be the judge, Mr. *Brs* Cauſe falleth. I have tryed it, and by tryall found it the hardeſt task to perſwade the multitude to receive Chriſt Crucified alone, to their juſtification and ſalvation. Prove the more ungodly party, ſpecially in the time of their diſtreſs, upon their death-bed, or otherwiſe when their Conſcience is awaked, and the terrors of God are upon them: Seek now to perſwade them to repoſe their affrighted ſouls upon Chriſt their Altar, to truſt in the Mediation of his blood, how averſe are they? they look upon Chriſt as a hard and ſtrict man, a Judge, a Law-giver, diſtributing ſtrict juſtice to every man according to his works. And they alas have no vertue, or goodneſs, or holines, to ingratiat themſelves into his favour, but ſin enough to incenſe the very jealouſie of his fury againſt them, therefore dare not come to him becauſe they have no worth of their own righteouſnes and works that they can plead for themſelves. Look to the more whited Phariſees, the Saints of Mr. *Brs* forming: how hard

is

is it to perſwade them to caſt off their own righteouſnes that they may be found in Chriſt alone. They put on their own ragg̃s firſt, and not Chriſt at all, but upon them. They thank God they have ſerved God from their youth up, have not defiled themſelves with the filth and iniquity which they have ſeen in others, have had ſuch vertues, and been full of ſuch and ſuch good works, therefore they doubt not but Chriſt will recompence them with life and ſalvation. But he that ſeeks to ſpoil or to perſwade them to ſpoil themſelves of the glory and power of ſuch their vertues and good works to juſtification, ſhall find it as hard a task as to wreſt the Club out of the hand of *Hercules*, as it is in the Proverb. Men after mine own heart ſaith Mr. *Br.* Be it ſo, yet that is nothing to the queſtion, except they be after Gods heart. And Mr. *Brs* Argument is hereby diſſolved: For it appears that it is not eaſy to perſwade the multitude to receive Chriſt alone to ſalvation.

But whether his chief ſcope in this his reaſoning, be not to condemn all the Proteſtant Churches of levity and impiety, for departing from *Rome* ſo eaſily in thouſands and ten thouſands together, in ſo many Nations, and within ſo few years, by the lure of this Libertine and ſoul-cozening doctrine (as he terms it) I leave it to his own Conſcience to judge. This himſelf makes evident, that in the Articles of grace and juſtification, he holds it a damnable ſchiſm in us ſo to have divorced our ſelves from *Rome*, and applyeth himſelf with all his ſtrength, to make up the breach, and bring us back again.

The reſt which Mr. *B.* hath interſerted, and which followeth in this Quere, is light and ridiculous, prepared for the gulling of light and ridiculous men, altogether beneath the weight and depth which is in Mr. *Bax.* and which he uſeth when he deals with men like himſelf, ſolid and ſerious, at leaſt in naturall and morall knowledg, ſuch is that which he hath, *p.* 327.

> B. *They all truſt Chriſt for the ſaving of their ſouls*, &c. *Are all theſe juſtified?* [*why not?*] *there wants a Morall and Theologicall ſincerity; why is that? but becauſe they take but halfe of Chriſt.*

Not to ſpeak here either of the prime piece of knowledg here taught, wherein *Morall* and *Theologicall* ſincerity, *i. e. Phyloſophicall* and *Metaphyſicall* ſincerity conſiſts, *viz.* in taking the whole and not the

the halfe of things: Nor ſecondly, of the mans faſtidious ſcorn of Scripture-terms, and his hunting after exotick words, to dimm and ſtifle the purity and ſimplicity of the Goſpel; I ſhall come to the matter it ſelfe, and here I demand of himſelf,

1 Whether they which receive Chriſt crucified do not receive whole Chriſt? *Chriſt which by the eternall ſpirit offered himſelf without ſpot to God*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 9.14. What was there here wanting of whole Chriſt? There was his divine nature, *the Eternall Spirit offering*, the humane nature *himſelf offered*, and the ſame in the integrity and purity of its celeſtiall endowments: *Without ſpot*; *if this be but half* Chriſt, which is the other half?

2 Or becauſe he underſtands by whole Chriſt, Chriſt in the fruits of all his offices, (as is moſt probable) whether he will deny them to receive whole Chriſt, which apply not all the ſeverall Acts and Fruits of his ſeverall offices to one and the ſame end, but to ſeverall ends to which his wiſedom hath appropriated them. Suppoſe a ſon of ſome *Luke*, that is a Phyſician, a Miniſter of the Goſpel, and a Father in his Family. If the ſayd ſon ſhall make uſe of the Acts and Fruits of all theſe Offices of his Father, not at all to one end, but to the ſeverall ends to which they are proper; of his Art and Phyſick to cure his diſeaſed body, of his Goſpel-doctrine to illuminate his underſtanding, and heal his wounded ſoul, and of his proviſion of victuals to preſerve his life, and nouriſh his body: and not of phyſick, word and bread together, for one and the ſame the nutriment of his body, ſhall this man therefore be ſaid not to own and receive his whole Father, but half of him? Even ſo the Offices of Chriſt are various, and his actings in them tend to various ends, ſome to our quickning, ſom to our enlightning, ſome to our juſtification, ſome to our ſanctification, *&c.* Do I take but half Chriſt, becauſe I apply not all the Actings and Fruits of all his Offices to my Juſtification only, and none of them to the other honourable ends to which he hath appointed them? who can bear the abſurdity?

3 Whether it be poſſible for any man (according to the rule and tenor of the Goſpel) by a lively faith to apply to himſelf the ſatisfaction of Chriſts death, and yet to remain unpardoned and unjuſtified? or for ſuch a one to abide unſpiritualliz'd and unſanctified? If not, then the reaſon why the multitude wch profes they truſt Chriſt for the ſaving of their ſouls (as Mr B. is pleaſd to phraſe it) do remain unjuſtified, is becauſe they profeſs, but have not a

lively faith in his death: and not (as Mr. *Br.* saith) for want of I know not what Moral, Theological, decompounded, phantastical sincerity consisting in laying hold on the half of Christ, *i. e.* either his wounded, and not his whole parts, or Christ the Mediator, not the Mediator Christ. I can no better distinguish his meaning, sith himself hath refused to do it. Of the same nature is that which he hath, *pag.* 328.

> B. *Though some thinke nothing is preaching Christ, but preaching him as a pardoning justifying Saviour. Indeed among the Turks and Indians that entertain not the Gospell, it is necessary to preach his pardoning office, yea and the verity of his Natures and Commission: Therefore when the Apostles preached to Jews and Pagans, they did first and chiefly teach them the person and offices of Christ, and the great benefits which they might receive by him. But when they preach (as* James *) to be professors of the Christian Faith, they chiefly urge them to strive to enter, to fight that they may conquer, to run that they may obtain, to lay violent hands upon the Kingdom,* &c.

Either all this relates to Justification, or it is meer babble in the Ayr, sound without sense or substance, as much to his purpose as was his that trudged about all the Town from shop to shop to buy two penny-worth of *Circumstance* for the cure of his tooth-ach. For his quere is, whether our Doctrine which teacheth Justification by faith without works, do not confirm men in their soul-cozening Faith. If all doth relate to justification, then let him that can find, help me, without help I cannot find as much as a grain of reason in all or any part of it, such reason at least as befits *Mr. Br.* who grounds all his Religion upon reason.

To the first Clause I stand stupified, not knowing how to preach Christ to justification, but as Christ the Justifier; to pardon, but as Christ the pardoner; or to salvation, but as Christ the Saviour. Should I preach him as a condemner to justification, as an unpardoning Judg to salvation? As to his justifying me as he is a Lawgiver, either there hath been wanting something in Mr. B. dexteriry of teaching, or in my docility to apprehend, I am yet to be taught this lesson. All that he hath said hitherto, hath made it but odious and absurd, and here hee saith no more to perfect it.

To that which follows, the absurdity of it doth enough confute

tute it self. Who can endure to hear that the Apostles when they preached to Jewes and Pagans did; and we, if we should be sent to preach to the *Turks* and *Indians*, must first preach Christ alone to justification, and so generate in them a soul-cozening faith: But when once they become professors of the Christian Faith, then the Apostles did, and we must teach them better, urging them no longer to cozen their souls with faith in Christ the Saviour, but by their own works to justifie and save themselves. He that delights in such a Gospel, let him be Mr. *B.* disciple.

It seems he is angry with *James* for not helping him erewhile in his great exigency, that he singles out him from all the Apostles, to father him with this intolerable doctrine. But whether *James* give him herein any relief, hath been before examined.

As for the rest of the Apostles, let *Paul* give the Testimony for himself and them. *There is one Lord and Mediator, Christ Jesus, one Faith, one Baptisme, one Lord and Father of all,* Ephe. 4. 5. 1 Tim. 2. 5. Not two Christs, and two Faiths, one to cozen at first, and the other to save the soul afterward. *If Paul or an Angell from heaven should preach any other Gospell then what you have heard* [from me at first while Pagans] *let him be accursed,* Gal. 1. 8. Therefore many years after the *Romans* and *Galathians* had been professors of the Christian faith, he seeks to root them fast by faith alone in Christ, and not to start from their first principles; reducing such as went a whoring after works to help faith in justifying them, pronouncing them accursed, and Apostates from Christ, that should so fall off from their first liberty in Christ.

That all obedience, yea faith in Christ to all obedience, vertue and good works is to be preached and urged upon them that profess the Christian faith, is so true, that he is but a maimed preacher of Christ that doth it not, but all to sanctification, not to justification. This is the true Preacher of Christ that preacheth Christ to good works, not works to win Christ, that seeks to bring us into *Marriage-union with Christ, that we may bring forth fruit to God*, Rom. 7. 4. Not that we should bring forth bastard-fruit from another, that we may be married to Christ. But this is not Mr. *Brs.* business, he speaks of fruit to justification.

To conclude what I have to say to this Quere, It is his doctrine that teacheth a soul-cozening Faith, a Faith made up of a sardle of works and rags of our own righteousness, as in his larger definition of justifying Faith he hath described it.

CHAP. XIII.

Mr. Baxters *calumnie, that this doctrine doth harden the Papiſts in their Popery, and give occaſion to many learned Proteſtants to turn Papiſts, anſwered.*

HIS fifth Quere hath no ſhew of weight in it, deſerving an examination, ſavouring more of the Spleen than of the judgment of the Author. Nevertheleſs, though it declares only the ſtomach and indignation of the man againſt the truth, rather then any ſtrength in his hand to hurt it: yet becauſe it is formed for the deceiving of the ſimple and unwary, upon whom ſounds oft times take no leſs impreſſion than actuall ſtrokes; to prevent damage to ſuch I ſhall examine whatſoever may ſeem materiall in it, as I have the reſt.

B. pa. 329. 5. *Laſtly, Is not this excluding of ſincere Obedience from Juſtification, the great ſtumbling-block of Papiſts? and that which hath had a great hand in turning many learned men from the true Proteſtant Religion to Popery?*

That by obedience he meaneth all morall qualifications and works as they are vertues and works, we have before learned from his own words: ſo his meaning is, that the Doctrine of *Paul*, and the Churches which follow him, *viz.* Juſtification by Faith, and not by works, is guilty of the damnable and pernicious evills which he here chargeth upon it. Theſe evills are two.

1 It is the great ſtumbling-block of the Papiſts.

2 It hath carried back many learned men from the Proteſtant Religion to Popery. To both theſe I ſhall ſpeak in order. 1 Of its hardning the Papiſts in Popery.

Is it not the great ſtumbling-block to Papiſts? ſaith Mr. *Br.*

I anſwer, 1 *Was not Chriſt* (and that in this very point of juſtifying the ungodly by an imputed righteouſneſs, without any inherent righteouſneſs of their own) *a ſtone of ſtumbling, and a rock of offence to the Jewes*; at which they were ſo offended, that to their eternall ruine, they reject the Goſpel and ſalvation of Chriſt unto this day? *Rom.* 9. 32, 33. 1 *Cor.* 1. 23. 1 *Pet.* 2. 8. What then? muſt Chriſt be anathematized? Nay, but let the truth of Chriſt ſtand,

ſtand, and man be the lyar, the tranſgreſſor. It is *ſcandalum, acceptum non datum*, an offence taken, not given: And *bleſſed is he whoſoever ſhall not be offended in* [*or at*] *Chriſt*, Mat. 11. 6. Lu. 7. 23. But if any will be offended, and dath, the Lord Chriſt admoniſheth him of the danger: *Whoſoever ſhall fall on this ſtone ſhall be broken; but on whomſoever it ſhall fall, it will grind him to powder*, Mat. 21. 44.

2 And as found a reaſon is it that our doctrine of Juſtification hinders the Papiſts from turning Proteſtants, as was that of ſome Statiſts that complained againſt the Church of *Geneva*, that they hindered the converſion of Papiſts in thoſe parts, by forbidding dancing; and the like grave conſideration by ſome great Politicians in *England*, that the forbearing of Bull and Bear-baiting, and other ſports on the Lords day, hardned the Papiſts of *Lancaſhire* in their Popery. When Religion is made a meer piece of policy, and to have in it at the beſt no more than a dreſs of dreggiſh formality or morality, no marvail if ſuch dirty and unſpirituall means are made uſe of to ſpread it.

3 But how deep doth this effect lurk in its cauſe, ſo that only this one mans ſagacity can ſmell it out? That the Papiſts in the leaſt things will not turn Proteſtants, except we in the worſt turn Papiſts. For this Article of Juſtification is the greateſt of all the queſtions controverted between us and the Papiſts. All the reſt not ingredients of, or meerly relating to this, may the Papiſts continue in (if not of malice or wilfulneſſe) with a poſſibility of ſalvation. They are but wood, hay, and ſtubble built upon the foundation, the very builders whereof may be ſaved, *but ſo as by fire*, ſaith the Apoſtle. But a Trentified Papiſt, by the coherent judgment of the beſt Divines, cannot be ſaved, becauſe hee holdeth not the foundation ſure and pure, but mixeth mans works with the grace of God in Chriſt to Juſtification. And their judgment is grounded upon the authority of the Apoſtle: *Yee are faln from grace, Chriſt is become void* [*or forfeyted*] *to you, whoſoever are juſtified by works.* An ardent love to *Romes* ſhavelings out of doubt poſſeſſeth Mr. *Br.* that he doth not only wiſh himſelf (as did the Apoſtle) but would make himſelf and all us accurſed, that they might be (not ſaved, but) damned with us. For if they reject all other their errors, and practically retain but this one, by it they forfeyt all the ſalvation of the Goſpel.

4 Nay contrariwiſe, as long as this Article of the Goſpel was diligently preached, and ſtoutly maintained in the Proteſtant Churches,

Churches, and that not with quirks and quidities of humane Art, but by the nervous arguments of Scripture alone: ſo long the Kingdom of Antichriſt more and more decayed, and they which were before marked up as ſlaves to that rivall of Chriſt, brake the fetters, and came in by thouſands and ten thouſands, taking the Kingdom by a holy and violent force. But ſince the time this Doctrine hath been leſs preached and patronized, the Reformed Churches have been ſtill in a languiſhing, and the Antichriſtian Kingdom in a growing condition; as Mr. *Br.* himſelf, ſo great a Reader, and ſo fully acquainted with the Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtories, muſt neceſſarily grant. And why hath this ſtop to the promoting of the Goſpel befaln the Churches, but that the Lord Chriſt doth herein declare his offence taken againſt us for not making him our all, that hee alſo ceaſeth ſo victoriouſly, as in former times to vouchſafe his preſence among us?

5 But ſince Mr. *Br.* is leapt home to them, and many foot beyond many of the more moderate ſort of them, in the point of juſtification by works, and ſo hath removed the ſtumbling-block, let him ſpeak by experience, how many of them are come in to him to be his Proſelytes, rejecting the Papacy, and other their Popiſh errors. Or whereas his Friends the *Arminians* have in this and many other of their Tenents ſo many decads of yeers cloſed fully with them, where is the confluence of Papiſts to them ſeen, that ſhaking off their former opinions and practices, profeſs themſelves Converts? A Cardinals Hat perhaps hath been ſent, or a fat Biſhopprick promiſed to ſome of the moſt deſerving men among them (in relation to the Romiſh Cauſe) to allure them to further and higher deſervings of this kind. But the holy Mother Church (I warrant you) ſticks where ſhe was. If ſhee ſhould permit but one ſtone of her Fabrick to be looſed, it might cauſe a crack in the whole.

This part of the Quere I ſhall therefore upon theſe Conſiderations leave as reaſonleſs, and examine the next whether there be any more reaſon in it.

To the 2d. *That it hath had a great hand in turning many learned men from the Proteſtant Religion to Popery.*

1 I demand whether there be not a contradiction in the *Quere?* How were they ever eſcaped from the dregs of Popery, that yet held Juſtification by works, which is the *very root out of which all other Popiſh errors almoſt ſpring, and by it ſelf alone is worſe than all the reſt?*

Or

Or how can such persons be said to have turned from the Protestant Religion, that joyned not with the Protestants in the very Foundation. Let all the Confessions of all the Protestant Churches be read, and but one produced that hath not with all defiance rejected justification by works as a foul abhomination. They must needs be very learned men, that had learned this mysticall Art of turning in Religion from them to whom they were not joyned, unto them from whom they were never severed.

2 If any have so turned, *they went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would without doubt have continued with us: But they went out from us, that they might be made manifest that they were not of us*, 1 Joh. 2. 19.

3 Nevertheless they that are truly learned, *i. e.* wch *have the mysterie of Christ revealed to them, not by flesh and blood, but by their Father which is in heaven, that have learned as the truth is in Christ Jesus, that have been taught of God, and have so heard and learned of the Father, that by his teaching they come to Christ, being drawn and given to Christ by the effectuall teaching of God:* these shall never turn back again; *They are built upon the Rock, and all the gates of Hell shall not prevail against them: It is the will of the Father, that of all those which are thus given to Christ, he should lose nothing, but raise it again at the last day*, Mat. 16. 18. Eph. 4. 21. Jo. 6. 45. 39.

4 By the vanity, levity, changes and whirlings of these learned ones in humane literature, the Lord is pleased to publish to the world how vain, and of no power such learning is (while unsanctified) to true blessedness. *I thank thee O father*, &c. *that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to babes*, Mat. 11. 25. *I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent*, saith the Lord. *Where is the wise? where is the Scribe? where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?* 1 Cor. 1. 19, 20. *Professing themselves wise, they became fools*, [because] *they became vain in their imaginations*, Rom. 1. 21, 22. *So vain, that they bring the transcendent mysteries of divine* things to be tryed in the scales of humane reason, and that which the Apostle saith is falsly called *Science*, i. e. philosophicall learning. A due stroke of Gods judgment upon them that will be wise without Christ, and against him; that while they will dispute, and in their disputations subject the doctrines of Faith (which can have no other foundation but the authority of the word) to the rules and principles of secular Arts, they shall with

with all their Art and Learning, dispute themselves out of Christ, out of Happiness.

5 No more hath befaln them herein, than God had before threatned should be the doom of such. *Because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved: For this Cause God shall send them strong delusions that they should believe a lye, that they might all be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness*, 2 Thes. 2. 10. 12.

6 And most justly, for pride goeth before destruction. And what higher degree of pride, than that an impure worm should swell with such an opinion of his own righteousness, that he will refuse the life and salvation which are by Christ, except his own righteousness be valued at so high a rate by the eternall God, as to constitute him worthy of it? Yet such is the high spirit of these self-righteous workers, that they will enter heaven, triumphing in their own strength and righteousness, or els refuse to enter. *Magis honorificum est habere aliquid ex merito* (saith *Bellarmine*, speaking of Merit) *quam ex sola donatione; ideo deus ut filios suos magis honoraret*, &c. It is more honourable to have something of merit than of meer gift; Therefore God, that he might the more honour his Children, hath made a way that they should get to themselves eternall life by their own merits. To the same purpose is that of another of the same nest, *Absit ut justi vitam eternam expectent, ut pauper Eleemosynam, multo enim glorioſius est, ipsos quasi victores & triumphatores eam possidere, tanquam palmam suis sudoribus debitam.* i. e. Far be it that the righteous should expect eternall life, as a poor man doth an Alms. For it is much more glorious that they should possess it, as conquerours and triumphers do the Crown due to their labors. When this arrogant conceit once possesseth M. *Brs.* learned men to make themselves glorious by their ecclypsing of the glory of Gods grace, no marvail if we see them not so much turning as turned out among the dogs and swine. *How can ye believe which seek honour one of another, and not the honour which is of God only*, John 5. 44.

Tapper. in, Art. Lovan. Tom 2. art. 9.

7 Yet for one that Mr. *Br.* can mention, who in hatred of this Doctrine hath made a defection from, I dare to undertake to produce hundreds that by the sweetness of it, and demonstration of the Spirit in preaching it, have been drawn to the profession of the Protestant Religion. It is a conclusion of *Luther*, lamenting the schisms and Controversies stirred in the Churches about lighter and

and lesser things: That if these had been layd aside, and this one Article of Justification by Faith alone had been by the counited labors of all the Churches, most of all (though not only) preached and continued to be preached to this day, saith he, the whole Kingdom of the Pope had by this time laid wholly shivered. How adversatively do the spirits of *Luther* and Mr. *Br.* fight either against the other? Yea of the many learned that Mr. *Br.* speaks of, we can find him particularizing but one, his St. *Grotius*, pag. 331. thus,

B. *This Doctrine was one that helped to turn off* Grotius *to Cassandrian Popery. See Grotij votum*, 21, 22, 23. 115.

Is *Grotius* so turned off? most likely is it sure, that Mr. *Br.* will follow him, and truly we may add [if not] this doctrine, surely that which is worse hath turned off Mr. *Br.* to Tridentine and Jesuitized Popery: See Mr. *Brs.* Aphorisms, not in four pages only, but almost in all the passages of that Book and its Appendix: And thus *Grotius* and he make up (if not many, yet) a number of learned men turn'd to Popery.

This shall suffice to have said to the matter of Mr. *Brs.* Quere; But memorable and worthy to be written upon the purest chrystal waters, where he that can may read them, are the reasons which Mr. *Br.* annexeth, for which this Doctrine hath had a great hand in turning many learned men to Popery, *viz.*

B. *pa.* 329. *When they see the language of the Scripture in the fore-cited places, so plain* [*that no mortall eye can discern it*] *to the contrary: When* Illyricus, Gallus, Amsdorfius, &c. *shall account it a heresie in* George Major, *to say that good works are necessary to salvation: And when, if* Melchior Adamus *(say true)* eò dementiæ & impietatis ventum erat ut non dubitarent quidam hæc axiomata propugnare; Bona opera non sunt necessaria ad salutem: Bona opera officiunt saluti. Nova obedientia non est necessaria. *When even* Melanctons *credit is blasted for being too great a friend to good works; though he ascribe not to them the least part of the work or office of Christ: And when to this day many Antinomian teachers, who are magnified as the only Preachers of free grace, do assert and proclaim, That there is no more required to the perfect irrevocable Justification of the vilest Murtherer or Whoremaster, but to believe that hee is justified, or to be perswaded that God loveth him.*

And again, p. 331. *This Doctrine was offensive to* Melancton, Bucer, *and other moderate Divines of our own.*

What of all this? and what is the issue at last? Therefore these learned men with great learning and wisedom, took the advantage *Cum ratione insanire*, like a *pampred horse*, with a fly in his tayl, to catch the snaffle in the teeth, and in great indignation to runn mad to *Rome*. Who els but Mr. *Brs.* learned men could have expressed so much grace and wit? And it seems they were all fellow-students in the same School, els could not their good wits have jumpt together upon so pretty a flight. And it seems Mr. *Br.* by his exagitation of the damnable doctrines of the *Antinomians* in our days, doth tacitely invite the learned to joyn with him in prosecuting the same learned device.

As to the matter of these severall particulars, somwhat, yet not much is needfull to be said. 1 To that of *George Major*, &c. Mr. *Br.* here discovereth fully (what elswhere in this his Tractate he doth not totally hide) his enmity and swelling against the first reformation of the Churches by *Luther* and others, that hee accounts it a schismaticall defection, not a due reformation. Hee spares the names of *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Calvin*, &c. lest his spitting in their faces, should make his own odious to all knowing Christians: But the Doctrine which he reprehendeth under the names of *Illyricus*, *Gallus*, *Amsdorfius*, &c. he knows to be the same which those former Divines, with all the Protestant Churches have taught and propugned. Concerning *Gallus*, either what he was, or what he did, I can give no account. *Illyricus* is reported by some to have been somwhat hot and heady in prosecuting all that he undertook; but that at any time he entred the lists with *George Major*, I find not. This I find, that they both lived and conversed together at *Jenes* in the same University, and were both adversaries to *Strigelius* a famous Divine, unto whom between them they procured great persecution: But *Amsdorfius* was one of those eminent instruments of Christ in the reformation, *who bare the burden and heat of the day*, was a Colleague with *Luther* in the University of *Wittenberg* at the first dawning forth of the Gospel, his yoke-fellow in the labors and in the sufferings of the Gospel, both in prosperous and difficult times one and the same; Holding fast the same principles which were laid in his heart while a young man, even to his old age, and death, which God prolonged untill the 88. year of his age. I know not any one professed Protestant that hath aspersed

ſed him for any thing that in all that time of ſo long a life, he either commited or omitted, as unworthy of a learned and faithful Miniſter of Chriſt, until the candor of M. Br. hath now done it. Truth it is, that *George Major* in his time, about a hundred years ſithence, when *Luther* was dead (not daring ſo to do while he was living) ſet forth ſome propoſitions and diſputations of the neceſſity of good works to ſalvation; and finding himſelf quickly encountred, he after more fully explained himſelf, or rather endeavoured to make his Doctrine the more ſmooth to be ſwallowed, by allaying it thus: That we are juſtified by faith only, but not ſaved without works. So that good works are neceſſary though not to juſtification, yet to ſalvation. At this his Doctrine, as all the Churches and their Miniſters were much offended, ſo were there many that confuted it; among others *Strigelius*, *Wigandus*, & this *Amſdorfius*, who wrote againſt him his *Bona opera officiunt ſaluti*: Good works are hinderances of ſalvation. A propoſition I acknowledg not well ſounding in words; but the ſubſtance of Treatiſes is not to be judged alway from their Titles; This work of Mr. *B.* hath a golden Title, *Aphoriſms of Juſtification:* untill a man hath read the Book, he would have ſuppoſed from the Title, they had bin Aphoriſms to maintain, not to deſtroy Juſtification by free grace. So on the other ſide the Paradoxical ſound of *Amſdorfius* his titular poſition, doth in no wiſe deny his Treatiſe thereon to be orthodox, except Mr. *Br.* can produce any thing thence to prove that he affirms good works in themſelves to be ſo, and not only in the ſenſe wherein *George Major* affirms them neceſſary to ſalvation. Or why this Aſſereion ſtifly maintained by *George Major*, ſhould not be counted a hereſie in him as well as in the Papiſts, or the Phariſees before them, I ſee no other reaſon but this, that then Mr. *Br.* having more worthily deſerv'd than he, will be thought fit to be honoured with the Title of Doctor in the ſame profeſſion.

2 To that of *Melchior Adamus*, I ſay no more, but that the Teſtimony of an Adverſary without proofes is unworthy, or at leaſt incompetent to bow our belief to it. What wreſting and curtilating there is of their ſentences, whom in this caſe ſuch men would defame, is obvious to every mans notice. He ſhould in ſtead of his *Individuum vagum, his quidam*, have named ſome ſingular perſons, & at leaſt have quoted ſome of their writings, in which they have propugned ſuch aſſertions, that we might have ſcarched and found whether it were ſo, if he would have been believed. Otherwiſe, if

things were only for diſputations-ſake handled in the Schools, this argues not the propugners to be of that judgment.

3 What he ſaith of *Melanction* and *Bucer*, whether it be true or falſe, is of the like moment. Be it that ſome crazie brains, or corroding ſonns of *Momus* (with whom the world too much at all times aboundeth) envied becauſe they could not match, and ſought to defame, becauſe they envied the excellent parts of theſe two Worthies, was either of them ſo wiſe and learned, as to run headlong from Chriſt to *Rome*, upon it? Nay, this is a piece of learning which Mr. *B.* & his *Grotius* have of very late yeers learned and taught. The true ſervants of Chriſt in former times were ſo little ſcholaſticall, that they were ignorant in this Art. Yet whether *Melanction* after the death of *Luther* gave not ſome occaſion to the Proteſtant Churches to mourn till this day for the yet remaining fruits of his timorouſneſs, or (as Mr. *Br.* will have us call it) moderation, I leave to the wiſe who are acquainted with the paſſage of thoſe times, to judg. But I never underſtood any ſuch thing imputed to *Bucer*, or that he hath left any other but a ſweet ſavour behind him. Nor any thing that can ſo dim the worth of *Melanction*, that his name ſhould not be in continuall veneration among the Saints: For who can ſay he is without his infirmities? But in the point of Juſtification by Faith only, he was ſound till death.

4 But what hee ſaith of the *Antinomian* Teachers what they preach at preſent, and yet are magnified for the only preachers of Free Grace, is that which ſtartles Mr. *Br.* and makes him run many furlongs beyond *Grotius*. If his haſt had not put him out of breath, he might have told us what places of *England* are haunted with theſe Spirits, that we might have ſhunned them. Why ſhould a man of ſuch animoſity that ſcorns to look upon *Colier*, *Hobſon*, *Spriggs*, and ſuch like fellows, be ſo troubled about theſe unconſiderate animals which he here mentioneth: what the former three are I do not know; yet by what I have heard of them, I ſhould think them not ſo inconſiderate as theſe, to affirm juſtifying faith to conſiſt in a mans believing that he is juſtified, or in a perſwaſion that God loveth him? But that there are either more than one fountaine opened for the purging away of ſinne, or any other propitiation for our ſins ſet forth by God. Beſides Chriſt alone, or any other means to effectualliæ it to the chief ſinners beſides faith in his blood, or that the juſtification which is by Faith, is

(according

(according to the tenor of the Gospel) revocable, I am so far an Antinomian of Mr. B. defining, to deny, and cannot find him so learned a Papist or Pharisee to prove it.

There is nothing else which I see in this *Quere* which he hath not in substance said, and so hath been examined before, or else will more properly offer it self to examination in that which remaineth to be examined. And this shall suffice to have said to that one and yet five-fold Argument comprehended in his five *Quere's*.

CHAP. XIV.

Mr. Baxters *last Argument drawn from the Testimony of many approved Authors Examined and Answered.*

HIs last Argument is drawn from the testimony and authority of many eminent Divines in the Protestant Churches, which he saith have taught and published this doctrine before him. This Argument is principally urged not in the Aphorisms, but the Appendix. And althongh Mr. *Br.* tell us, *App.* p. 111. that he alleageth them (not to confirm his doctrine, but) to shew that he is not singular, but hath the concurrent judgments of others therein: And *App.* p. 167. & 188. that he doth it to satisfie them which charge him with singularity, not as an appeal to man: Yet it is too evident that his purpose herein is to abuse the less knowing and considering part of his Readers with this more then with the most of his other Arguments. Great names he knowes doe make deep impressions upon the fancies of men that have much of affection, but little of judgment. And that these look not so much to the matter as to the men. Could they think Mr. *Br.* hath here said no more then these and these confessedly pious and learned Worthies have said before him, they will take him for a blasphemer that shall say against him. Therefore he musters together so many choyce vessels and pretious servants of Christ, trusting to the either imbecility or credulity of his vulgar Readers, that either they cannot or will not examin and compare these and Mr. *B.* together, and then Mr. *Br* shall be taken to be of the same spirit with Dr. *Preston*, Dr. *Twisse*, *Calvin*, *Pareus*, *Perkins*, and the other renowned Divines whom he alleageth, and then also it must be all truth that he hath said, after such men, and whosoever shall oppose

poſe him muſt be brought forth to be ſtoned.

But where is the mans ſincerity that will be juſtified by the morall ſincerity of his obedience and works? Was it not wholly baniſhed from him, when he cited theſe men as concurring in judgment with him, when he knowes them all to deteſt his aſſertions againſt which we except, more then death it ſelf, and that many of them have jeoparded, and ſome of them laid down their lives and blood to give teſtimony to the contrary Aſſertions? Or will Mr. *B.* name any one of theſe at whoſe judgment his doctrine ſhall ſtand or fall, as true or erroneous? Why doth he thus abuſe the ſimple, thereby diſcovering his impudent fallaciouſneſs to the intelligent; with whom elſwhere he ſeeks chiefly to ingraciat himſelf? But come we to the Teſtimonies which he alleageth.

Bax. 1 *Mr.* Wallis, *Faith is an accepting of Chriſt offered, rather then a beleeving of a Propoſition affirmed?* App. p. 111.

Who hath denied this? Or what is this to Juſtification by works? It may poſsibly be ſomething to the Queſtion not conſiderately there propoſed; but nothing at all lifting with that concluſion, to which all the reſt which he delivers are but preparatives.

Next to Mr. *Wallis* he alledgeth Dr. *Preſton*, at the end of the ſame page. The ſix firſt Poſitions wherein he affirms him to ſpeak the ſame thing with himſelf, I ſee no ſound reaſon why any ſhould except againſt. But if Mr. *B.* or Dr. *Preſton*, or *Paul*, or an Angel from heaven ſhall deduce erratick and erroneous Concluſions from thoſe Premiſſes, they are not to be heard, but reſiſted at the face. None of the worſt Hereticks but agree in ſome principles with the moſt Orthodox, yet this nothing hinders but that the aſſertions in which they diſſent may be altogether pernicious.

How far and how unanimouſly all the Proteſtant Churches maintain the ſeventh point wherein Mr. B. affirms this pious and learned Doctor to agree with him, hath been before fully expreſſed, in the examination of the fourth Argument. So that it is uſeleſs here to run over ſo many paſſages of the Author, from *p.* 112. to *p.* 117. of the Appendix, to declare that this one man ſaith what all the reſt ſay and hold with him, *viz.* That juſtifying Faith is an accepting of Chriſt as Lord and Saviour. But what is this to the ſubſtance of the queſtion to which Mr. B. anſwereth?

Where it is objected to Mr. *Br Qu.* 14. that he ſo layeth this poſition, that he may thereby lay a ground-work for Juſtification

by

by works? Doth Dr. *Preston* to this end make Christ as Lord the object of Justifying Faith? or any where affirm him to be offered as a Law-giver or Commander of morall works and duties, to our justifying? Much less doth he affirm that such works have any thing to do with Faith in justifying.

A notable skill hath Mr. *Br* in confounding when he should divide and distinguish, and in distinguishing when there is no need; as either may serve to his purpose. He knowes that Dr. *Preston* when he treats of the New Covenant, comprehends under it the whole doctrine and all the Promises of Grace made *Yea* and *Amen* in Christ; as the same Christ is given to us not onely to Justification, but also to regeneration, illumination, sanctification, and whatsoever the Grace of the Eternall Father hath made him to us. And when he treats of Faith, he handles it as the instrument by which not onely Justification, but also all the other benefits of Christ may be made ours, in receiving Christ the treasury & spring of all appropriated to us. Therefore in describing the New Covenant he describes it in generall as the womb of all the blessings which are attainable by Christ, and not of Justification and Salvation alone. And in describing Faith he describes it as the instrument by which we apprehend and appropriate to our selves, not onely Christ as righteousnes and salvation, but also as wisedome and sanctification, yea all that tends to the perfecting of a poor sinner, to our selves. Therefore is it that he speaks more largely of the Covenant, and treats more fully of it then needed, if he had been to speak of it onely to Justification and Blessednes: and that he speaks of Faith more largely, and mentioneth other acts of it then are required to this one end: And necessarily must he so do, else should he have maimed both the Covenant of Grace, and the Faith of Christ. Here whatsoever Dr. *Preston* speaketh of the Covenant and Faith in generall, of which some part belongeth to the interessing of us to sanctification and other blessings which are by Christ, Mr. *Br* to beguile his Reader, confoundeth and confineth to Justification, as being spoken of it alone. When contrariwise the Doctor doth enough cleerly expres the distinct benefits of the Covenant, and the distinct acts of Faith receiving the distinct benefits; in the very words which he alledgeth out of him, *App. p.* 117. *Thou shalt receive the gift of Righteousnes wrought by him, for an absolution for thy sins, and for a reconciliation with me:* [This is our Justification] *And thereupon thou shalt grow up in love and obedience towards*

towards me [This is our ſanctification.]

But ſuppoſe he ſhould have affirmed that Faith, as it cleaveth to Chriſt, not onely for the ſprinkling of his blood for Juſtification, but withall for the effuſion of his ſpirit to ſanctification, and the ſhedding forth of his beams for illumination, and the ſtretching forth of his Almighty arm for ſupportation, &c. doth in all theſe acts juſtifie: as ſome Divines do ſeem to ſpeak, though (without prejudice to their reputation) not enough adviſedly: yet both he and they are ſo far from making either the moſt ſpiritual knowledge and wiſedom, which are the immediate fruits of illumination; or love, righteouſnes, and holines, and their acts or works which are the immediate fruits of ſanctification, to be in any reſpect uſefull to juſtification; that they utterly deny, peace, joy, and hope, the immediate fruits of Juſtification, to be any way effectuall and uſefull in this buſineſs. But I find not Dr. *Preſton* any where laying that ground-work, much leſs erecting ſuch a building on it.

To the five laſt points if Mr. *Br* hold them in that which I have expreſſed to be Dr. *Preſtons* ſenſe, yea which himſelf expreſſeth to be his own ſenſe, I have nothing to ſay againſt him. The tenth onely excepted, to which I muſt be alſo mute, becauſe neither doth Mr. *Br* alledg what the Doctor ſaith, and I have not that Treatiſe of his to inform me.

But all this is but a playing with holy things, he might as well have ſaid Dr. *Preſton* conſents with him in confeſſing there is a God, a Chriſt, a Juſtification, a man, a ſinner to be juſtified, as have ſaid moſt of what he hath here ſaid. We expected he ſhould have produced teſtimonies of other Divines ſpeaking in common with him, what he ſpeaks in common with the Papiſts, in oppoſition to the doctrine of the Proteſtants.

In his Appendix, p. 167. and thenceforth to the end of the Book. he brings a new ſupply of Teſtimonies, which he intituleth

Bax. *Sayings of excellent Divines; added to ſatisfie you who charge me with ſingularity.*

I ſhall examine ſo many of them as have any ſhew of agreement with Mr. *Br* in thoſe things wherein he fights againſt the doctrine of the Proteſtant Churches.

Bax. 1 *He alleadgeth Dr.* Twiſſe *his diſcovery of Dr.* Jacksons *vanity*, p. 528. *What one of our Church will maintaine that any one obteins actuall Redemption by Chriſt without Faith? eſ-*

ſpecially

specially considering that redemption by the blood of Christ, and forgivenesse of sins are all one. Eph. 1. 17. Col. 1. 14.

How prettily would he here instill into the thought of his Reader, that Dr. *Twisse* is a man of levity, here a subverter of Antinomianism, whereof in his *Aphorisms*, p. 173. he complained him to be a Pillarer? that here he subverteth Justification from eternity, whereof elsewhere he is an assertor? Nay here he speaketh of the Justification which is by vertue of the New Covenant, of the obteining of it actually to our selves. This neither Papist nor Protestant, neither Dr. *Twisse* nor Mr. Br ever affirmed to be without Faith.

Bix. 2. *Bishop* Hooper *cited by Dr.* Jackson. *Christ onely received our infirmities and originall disease, and not the contempt of him and his Law. Expounded by Dr.* Twisse *against Dr.* Jackson, p. 584.

His meaning in my judgment is onely this, that Christ hath made satisfaction for the imperfection of our faith and holinesse, although we continue therein untill death: But he hath not made satisfaction for the contempts and hatred of his word, &c. *in case men do continue therein unto death.*

Here is nothing of that which Mr. B. hunts after, that Christ hath satisfied for no offence, no infirmity committed against the New Covenant, but this alone is the sum of it, that they shall have no benefit by Christ, no one sin committed against the Law or Gospel pardoned to them, who live and dye impenitent and unbelievers. According to that of our Saviour, *Jo.* 8. 24. *Therefore I said unto you ye shall dye in your sins, for if ye beleeve not that I am he, ye shall dye in your sins.*

B. 3 *Alstedius Distinct Theol.* cap. 17. p. 73. *The Condition of the Covenant of Grace, is partly Faith, partly Evangelicall obedience, or holinesse of life proceeding from Faith in Christ.*

1 In how different a sense from Mr. B. the Protestants take the word Condition hath been before expressed. 2 But in that sense in which they [that use it] take it, it is one thing to be the condition of the New Covenant, another to be the condition of Justification, which is but one of many benefits of the Covenant of Grace. Had *Alsteed* in the Explication of himself affirmed holinesse of life a condition of justification, we should have had it at the full from Mr. B.

About the second thing wherein he alledgeth this mans testimo-

ny, I kuow no man queſtioning Mr. B. Neither is his next Teſtimony alledged from *Sadeel*, any thing of all the things wherein *Mr.* B. joyneth with the papiſts againſt the Proteſtants, therefore I ſpare the labour to tranſcribe it.

B. 4 *Rivet* in diſputat. de ſatisfactione. *God was not bound to accept the ſatisfaction performed by another though ſufficient*, &c. *Therefore there was a neceſſity that a Covenant ſhould intercede, and God himſelf propound a Mediator.*

That there muſt an agreement intercede on his part who was ſatisfied, without which the ſatisfaction had been in vain.

Idem. ibid. Thes. 4. 5. 6.

The act which in ſatisfaction God performeth, is of a ſupreme judge, relaxing his own Law and transferring the penalty of it upon another: ſo that in this relaxation Gods ſupreme dominion may be obſerved, &c. *And by the transferring the penalty from the ſinner, and exacting it of the ſurety; the relation of a party offended, as ſuch, is removed from God*, &c. Ja. 4 12.

God did relax his Law as being poſitive, and ſo relaxable, it is abrogate, &c. *The reſt is off from the Queſtion.*

To what purpoſe he here produceth the Teſtimony of this famous Doctor, except it be to declare his conſent with himſelf and *Grotius*, that the Law is not abrogated but relaxed onely, by means of Chriſts mediation; I know not. If ſo *Rivet* hath nothing for him, but much directly againſt him. 1 He affirms what no rationall man ever denied, that the Grace of God is free and not bound. How elſe ſhould it be Grace? 2 Yea it is free not onely from Co-action, but from abſolute neceſſity alſo. Onely the purpoſe of God being preſuppoſed, that he would ſo ſave by grace as that no one title of his juſtice ſhould fall, it was neceſſary there ſhould be the interceding of a Covenant and a Mediator. But is this to any other purpoſe then what he concludes with, *viz.* [*to fill up the vacant pages*, p. 188.] 3 That there muſt alſo an agreement or Covenant to this end paſs between the Father and the Son; is ours not his doctrine. 4 The relaxation of the Law in paſſing this Covenant between the Father and the Son, is the common doctrine of all proteſtants, as alſo that this is an act of Supream dominion of God that is under no Law. But when this Covenant is ratified, ſo that Chriſt becomes the undertaker, and God the accepter of ſatisfaction in relation to them for whom the ſatisfaction is made, ſo that the penalty of the Law as to their ſins,

is

is transferred upon Christ: whether the Law be not so abrogate to them, that they are no longer under the Curse of it, is the thing in question. And here Dr. *Rivet* gives his verdit for us against *Mr.* B. That to these the Law is abrogate, and God no more stands in the relation of a party offended against them. What more proper sword-man could he have brought forth to have hewn in pieces his own Cause?

B. 5 *Dr.* Twiss, vindic. grat. *and against* Cotton, *& consid: of* Til. Syn. Dort. *&c.*

What doth he mean by citing the Testimony of this Doctor so frequently, and catching fragments from him, whom he knows in the whole bulk of his works to destroy what himself would set up? yea though he complains against him for erecting the main pillar of Antinomianism, will he at length become his Disciple and build pillars with him. Dr. *Twisse* doth enough wash his hands from Mr. *Br* doctrine, even in these passages here cited from him, as I could fully manifest. But because I see the task would be tedious to examine particularly every particular testimony which he citeth: The same persons speaking in severall of the quoted places the same thing, and many speaking no more then one at once hath said before: I shall therefore abridge my self, in shewing in generall the dissenting judgment of those writers from him, however he would deceive his Reader with a credulous opinion that they consent with him. This will be done with an easie labour: when contrariwise to speak singularly to every singular testimony, would not yeeld forth fruit worthy the labour.

First then all the Testimonies of Dr. *Twisse*, Append. p. 172, 173. That of *Junius*, p. 173. of *Pareus*, *Piscator*, *Aretius*, p. 174. Dr. *Willet*, p. 179, 180. Mr. *Burges* of Justification, p. 187. are here compiled to tell them that are no friends to the doctrine of grace, (though it alone must befriend them if they will be saved) that all these Divines consent with him in his doctrine, first of a universall conditionall redemption or justification purchased by Christ, without any more effectuall satisfaction made to the justice of God for them that shall be saved, then for them that shall be damned: and secondly that morall obedience and good works are Concauses or Collaterall conditions with faith to justification.

To manifest how faithfull he is in these his allegations, I shall briefly express what the judgment of all Protestants is about these

points, that the advised Reader may judge whether these dissent from the rest and prepared the way for Mr. *Br* to prosecute his Assertions.

1 They grant that the promulgation of righteousnes & life is to be made universally & conditionally to all. *God knoweth who are his*, but the Heralds of his grace know not. Therefore by the command of Christ they are to testifie this word of life to all without exception, promising upon condition of beleeving, in the name and by the word of Christ, righteousnes and salvation. In mean time they meintein, Christ hath satisfied onely for those that the Father hath given him, so effectually as that by vertue of Christs purchase they shall receive power from above to beleeve unto salvation.

2 They are wont oft to use the word salvation (as the Scripture also doth) for glorification hereafter: and so take it as a distinct thing from justification: and involve into the condition of salvation more then into the condition of Justification.

3 By the word Condition they understand oft all the necessary antecedents, and sometimes also the necessary consequents either of justification or salvation. But so as they term such Antecedents the conditions, without which going before those ends cannot be attained, and those Consequents the conditions without which following we cannot attain the certain knowledge that we are justified and inrighted to glory.

4 That as oft as they speak of conditions of justification, they mean the justification of the New Covenant, not the justification immanent in God, or that which Mr. B calleth Christs own justification as the publick person, *Aph.* p. 195.

5 They utterly deny morall obedience and good works to be in any other sense a condition of justification, but as it is a consequent thereof to evidence it. Mr. B. indeed, as if he had not enough injured Mr. *Burges*, by making him in some kind a Patron of his Whimsies, in prefixing his name to this his Book, Dedicating it to him as above others an eminent Fautor of such doctrines; would willingly here also draw him *quasi obtorto collo*, to be the Founder of this his Jesuiticall error, as he makes him out, *App.* p. 187, 188. But I have before shew'd that the preaching of repentance and the preaching of Faith for the remission of sins, are in Gospel language one and the same thing. If Mr. *Burges* mean otherwise (but so as I am confident of the contrary) I should put no difference in the authority of *Mr.* Br and *Mr. Burgess* in this assertion.

The

The ſame force he uſeth to draw Dr. *Willet* to be of his part, *p.* 180, 181. where indeed in one clauſe the Doctor ſeems to me to have verified that proverb, *Quandoq; bonus dormitat Homerus:* yet without giving thereby any advantage to *Mr.* B. yea he ſpeaks directly oppoſit to him.

6 They deny all cauſality of good works to ſalvation.

7 Much more a concauſality in the ſame kind with Faith, and the ſatisfaction of Chriſt.

8 Moſt of all, that they in any rationall ſenſe merit it.

9 Or that as they make up the inherent righteouſneſs of man to be a Collaterall with the ſacrifice of, or righteouſneſs which is by Chriſt, to Salvation; ſo that we are ſaved by works, for works, as by Chriſt and for Chriſt. All this dirt they leave to *Mr.* B. to lick off from the nailes of the Ieſuits, bidding defiance againſt it as a Curſed doctrine. What they underſtand then of works as a condition of Salvation, is in this comprized; that to ſalvation already attained, they have the relation of an adjunct conſequent, and effect: But to the ſalvation hereafter to be attained, the relation of an Adjunct antecedent and diſponent, as alſo of an Argument confirming the hope and aſſurance thereof. They expreſs themſelves uſually in the phraſe of that Father, (though poſſibly miſunderſtood by ſome) *Via regni ſunt, non cauſa regnandi*, which ſome do, all ſhould thus conſtrue (not that they are the way to the Kingdom above, Chriſt alone being this way, but) they are the way of the Saints which are Chriſts ſpirituall Kingdom: according to that of the Apoſtle, *We are ſaved, not by works, for* &c. *God hath ordained us to walk in them*, Eph. 2. 8—10. in the way of ſanctification are they to be found, not in the wayes of iniquity and prophanneſs, who are inrighted by Chriſt to ſalvation.

Let now the vaſt difference and contrariety in ſo many particulars between *M. Brs.* and theſe Divines opinions, about this Queſtion be conſidered, and then let it be judged whether Mr. *Br.* had not taken his leave of all baſhfulneſs, when he would impoſe on his Readers an opinion, that he delivers upon this Argument nothing but what they had taught before him.

2 The Teſtimonies which he cites from *Calvin*, p. 175; *Perkins*, p. 177. do only affirm that the inherent righteouſnes of ſanctification doth ſometimes give the name of righteous perſons to beleevers, in the Scriptures, and this none denyeth. But here is no mention made that we are termed righteous from the righteouſ-

neſs

neſs of our own works, as or becauſe they are the condition of our juſtification, which is Mr. *Br.* Tenet. *Calvin* indeed rightly aſcribes it to the imputed righteouſnes of Chriſt, from which originally and radically our own unperfect righteouſnes is owned of God, and our ſelves righteous in doing it. But in no wiſe affirmeth that this our unperfect righteouſnes hath any finger in the procuration of Chriſts righteouſneſs to be imputed to us. But conſequentially given a flat denyall of it, which is the thing queſtioned in Mr. *B.* As for Mr. *Perkins*, he hath in the place alledged nothing relating to the queſtion. So that he doth an unexpiable wrong to the name of theſe famous men, to father them with this his error.

3 That which he citeth from *Perkins*, p. 176. & 178. and from *Zanchy*, p. 179. from Dr. *Davenant*, p. 181. *Molinæus*, *Scharpius*, and *Pareus*, p. 185. and Mr. *Burgeſs*, p. 186. are *nihil ad rem*. Nothing to the doctrines of Mr. *Br* that are queſtioned and charged as Popiſh, *&c.* He commits a Paralogiſm in detorting them into his opinions from which they are abhorrent. It is a meer *ignoratio Elenchi*, to bring theſe writers as concluding with him contradictorily to our Concluſions, who ſay nothing againſt us or for him. As thoſe of *Scharpius* and *Pareus*, p. 185. where he makes that wherein they affirm the ſubſtance of the New Covenant [in generall] to conſiſt, to ſpeak for him in contradiction to what we conclude of Juſtification, that is but one ſpeciall part of that Covenant: as if all that is affirmed or denyed of the former are ſo alſo of the latter. The falſhood whereof I have before manifeſted. Although Mr. *Burgeſs* in his Teſtimony alledged, p. 186. ſpeaks more againſt Mr. *Br* then for him, yet I make not his Concluſion a part of my Creed, as being too peremptory, and boldly fettering the hands of Gods grace to Lawes, which God hath not impoſed upon himſelf: *viz.* That Remiſſion of ſins is given us *onely* in the uſe of thoſe Graces, [which he had before named.] Had he ſaid [ordinarily, or moſtly] in ſteed of [onely] I ſhould not have excepted againſt him. But I take him to be ſo pious and learned, that upon a review he will relax and diſpenſe with his [*onely*] as not bottomed on the Scriptures there alledged, or any other. The like may be ſaid to the like ſpeech of *Molinæus*, p. 185. if he mean ſo univerſally as Mr. *Burgeſs* ſpeaketh. But perhaps neither of them by remiſſion of ſins mean Juſtification, but a *quid diſtinctum* from it, if ſo then they ſpeak nothing to Mr. *Brs* purpoſe.

pose. The other fore-cited Testimonies out of *Perkins* and *Zanchy*, labour of the same fallacy, having nothing against us in those points in which Mr. *Br.* professeth himself an adversary to us.

4 But it seems he most triumpheth in the testimony of Mr. *Ball*. Him he magnifieth and exalteth with superlative praises, more then all the great Theologers whom he alledgeth before and after him, as if all the rest were but *Sycamores* to this *Cedar*: [*This great, learned and holy Divine as almost England ever bred,*] and why so superexcellent? forsooth *he goes on in Grotius* [that *Cassandrian* Papist] *his own words translated*. And which is there of the Divines which *England* hath bred, that can be praised for so illustrious an act besides Mr. *Br.* and him? I envy not the praises of the man, yet this act of his meriteth it not, no not from Mr. *B.* For as far as he transcribes him, *p.* 182. *Mr. Ball* no further followes *Grotius* then to Gods relaxing of the Law to take satisfaction from Christ in our steed: But if he had also asserted that after satisfaction actually taken, they which in Christ have satisfied, are yet all their life-time under the Curse of the Law to bear it in their own persons; would Mr. *B.* have hidden it? Yet this is the thing in question between Mr. *B.* and the Protestants, whether after the giving and receiving of satisfaction for our breaches of the Law, the Curse of the Law be either nulled, or els onely in part relaxed, as to our bearing it.

Yea if he be as Mr. *B.* stiles him, then have we the testimony of *so great learned and holy a Divine as almost England ever bred against Mr. B.* himself not being able to deny any one almost that *England* ever bred, which hath written more directly and contrarily to Mr. B. then this man in his Tractate of Faith, about Justification. If elsewhere he contradicts himself, I shall oppose *Ball* against *Ball*, yea *Ball* in afflictions, when he lived by Faith and had nothing else but Christ apprehended by Faith to support his troubled soul, to *Ball* now raised to a prosperous state in the world, and who seeing the Court infected with Popery *Socinianism* and *Arminianism*, and no other bridge to preferment so effectuall as some shew of bending at least to these wayes, might possibly as far as Conscience would permit him, make use of the language there held most authentick. I say of the language, for I cannot condemn his doctrine alledged in his three following Testimonies if taken in a good sense. But his ambiguities of words seem to speak him out to have had a level to somewhat els besides the supporting of the truth; and yet

his

his Conſcience ſeems to hold him bound from ſaying any thing manifeſtly againſt the truth. Mr. B. may poſſibly tickle himſelf with his words, but his matter duly pondered gives him a ſting ſufficient to perſwade him to forbear laughter. Let the unbiaſſed judicious Reader, add conſideration to his reading and then judge.

The reſt of the teſtimonies which he hath here cited and quoted I let paſſe as altogether beſides the queſtions which Mr. B. hath ſet in agitation between himſelf and all the Proteſtant Churches.

And thus at length have his Arguments been examined which he brings to confirm his Juſtification by works.

He hath many things tending to the confirmation of ſome other Paradoxes ſcattered in his Aphoriſms, beginning at p. 123. of his Appendix, and ending at p. 164. but becauſe thoſe things are handled by way of diſputation againſt others, and Mr. B. as a challenger doth call out there by name *Mr. Owen* and *Maccovius* to a Duell with himſelf, each after other, expoſing them to the world as baſe and ſilly Animals in what they have ſaid, except they come forth into open field to make it good: It ſhall be both impertinent and uncivil in me to meddle in a buſineſs to which others and the ſame far more worthy and able, are called as to their peculiar task: I ſhould not be excuſed by any herein from being one that loveth ἀλλοτριεπισκοπεῖν, to be buſie in another mans office, ſpecially ſeeing I know not what theſe challenged have done or are doing in the defence of themſelves and the doctrine which they have aſſerted. Were it that their reputation alone, and not a truth of Chriſt which they had undertaken to defend were here clouded by Mr. B. I ſhould think it no fault in them to paſs it by in contemptuous ſilence: but ſeeing *Mr.* B. endeavours upon their ruines to erect his mounts againſt the City of the living God, to deſtroy it, or at leaſt ſpoyle it of its principall immunities; denying the full juſtification of the Lords redeemed ones in this world, & holding them under the curſe and wrath of God both in their life and death: I perceive not how they can be ſilent, without betraying the truth of God which they once undertook to defend. Since this was written I underſtand *Mr. Owen* hath fully vindicated himſelf, and learnedly defended all that Mr. B. had laid on his ſcore.

Thus far to his Arguments that he hath brought to prove Juſtification by works. I find no more, nor in theſe have I hidden any thing but ſet them forth in their fulleſt ſtrength.

CHAP.

Chap. XV.

Mr. Baxters *Plea to prove his Doctrine free from Popery, examined and refuted.*

I Come now to the most accurate, finest, and chiefest part of Mr. *Brs.* Art, his Alcumistry, by which hee turneth the basest metals into gold, darkness into light, death into life, deformity into beauty, and hell into heaven it self. All this he with strong endeavours labours to accomplish, while with strong confidence hee goes about to vindicate his doctrine from all error, all infection of Popery, *Socinianism*, *Pharisaism*, and to render it the same with the doctrine of *Paul* and of Christ, guiltless of all derogation to the praise of Gods grace, Christs merits, or the Saints comfort; Yea to set it forth in such a splendor, that although hee hath hitherto described such a grace of God, as by his donation was no more appropriated and peculiarized to *Peter* then to *Judas*, to the cursed in hell, than to the Saints in heaven: and such a Christ as reigneth Tyrant-like in the Kingdom of grace, chaining up his own, all his own subjects and friends, under the curse of the Law to bear the horrors and torments of it in soul and body all their life, yea after death as long as the world shall continue: though he hath taken away from the Saints (after their self-denyall, repentance, building themselves by their most holy Faith upon Christ the Rock, after their renovation and sanctification by the Spirit) all hope and possibility of attaining any assurance of Gods unchangeable love to them, or of their sinns irrevocably pardoned, or of their perseverance in the state of Grace, or of their indefeazable right to glory, or of their exemption from the curse and wrath of God while they live, or of the rest and freedom of their souls after death, either from the flames of Hell, or of Purgatory as long as the world standeth: After hee hath taught that no man shall have any part in Christ and his benefits, which procureth it not by his own righteousness, his own perfect righteousnesse [*in suo genere*] yea by the merits of his righteousnes: After that he hath proclaimed that his Gospel brings no better tidings of joy than these: Yet at length hee comes to varnish over such a Grace, such a Christ, such a Gospel, such a state of belie-

vers (who are all of his own faigning) with such paints and fine colours, as by them to enamour all men to embrace these as the only true and appetible Grace, Christ, Gospel, and state of beleevers. That this Doctrine is as smooth as *Esau's* hands, as free from Popery, Socinianism, from all injurie against the grace of God, all-sufficiency of Christs merits, consolation of the Saints, yea from all error whatsoever, as *Lazarus* was from sores, or the poor *Gadaren* from Devills, that had but a legion of them within him: That it agrees so harmoniously with the doctrine of *Paul*, as light with darkness, Christ with *Belial*, and the Temple of God with Idols: That in these things the Covenant of Grace consisteth indeed, therefore invites all at the consideration of the innocency and profundity of this his Gospel, to follow him in seeking a sure salvation by their own righteousness in the Curse of the Law.

To insist no longer upon generals, I shall examine the particular Apologies which he makes for this his Doctrine of Justification by works, to cleer it from the false imputations which the ignorant *Antinomians* that is (in his Construction) *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Twisse*, *Pemble*, and their followers might charge it withall.

His first Task which he appoints to himself, is to vindicate it from having any smack of Popery; how so? doth not both he and they maintain in the same words that we are justified by works? this he cannot deny. But forsooth there is a great difference in this, whose pen it is that drops the assertion. The Papists do it with a quill of a Capitoline, Mr. *Br.* with a quill of a *Kederminster* goose. This alters the case saith *Ployden*, & makes the same Proposition to be Popery and no Popery. But let us hear himself speaking, and multiplying his reasons why it must not be taken for Popery.

Br. *Aphor.* p. 304, 305. *How this differeth from the Popish Doctrine, I need not tell any Scholar that hath read their writings.* 1 *They take justifying for sanctifying, so do not I.* 2 *They quite overthrow and deny the most reall difference between the Old Covenant and the New, and make them in a manner all one. But I build this Exposition and Doctrine, chiefly upon the clear differencing and opening of the Covenants.* 3 *When they say we are justified by the works of the Gospell, they mean only that we are sanctified by works that follow faith, and are bestowed by grace, they meriting our inherent justice at Gods hands. In a word, there is scarce any one Doctrine, wherein even their most learned Schoolmen are most sottishly ignorant then in this of Justification:*

stification: So that when you have read them with profit and delight on some other subjects; when they come to this, you would pitty them, and admire their ignorance. 4 They take our works to be part of our legal Righteousnes: I take them not to be the smallest portion of it, but only a part of our Evangelicall righteousnes, or of the condition upon which Christs righteousnes shall be ours.

Suppose all these things were true, and the difference between him and the Papists were so great and manifold, as in these particulars he pretendeth, yet all this nothing evinceth his Doctrine not to be Popish, especially among Scholars to whom he appealeth. For 1 All this would but excuse him *a tanto, non a toto*, that in these particulars he is not, though in many other and greater, he be Popish.

2 Though he differed from them in the premisses, yet he is one with them in the conclusion. *Bellarmine* brings his arguments, and *Stapleton* his, to prove that works justifie. Are they not both Papists, because their arguments differ, when their Conclusion is one? Mr. *Br* thinks, that in some particulars his curious wit hath prompted him with a finer and surer way of demonstration to stablish Justification by works, than ever entered into the Cardinals Cap or Cranion: Doth this deny him to be a Papist, because he speaks more for them than they could for themselves? 3 Though *Bellarmins* and *Brs.* way of arguing do in some particulars differ, yet is the later as great an opposite to the truth of the Gospell in his way, as the former in his. Both oppugn with their utmost strength the doctrine of grace, though they divide the battell between them, the one scaling from the North, the other from the South.

2 But it cannot be truly sayd, that there are truly those reall differences between Mr. *Brs.* and the Papists Doctrine, which hee here particularizeth. For 1 Though in some of these particulars he speaks not the *idem*, yet he speaks the *Tantundem* with them. 2 Where he speaks not the very *idem*, hee speaks more grossly, Pharisaically, and adversatively to the truth then they. For the manifesting hereof, let us particularly examine those particulars in which he saith he differs from them.

1 Saith he, *They take justifying for sanctifying, so do not I.*

1 This speaks out their Doctrine to be more tolerable then his. For the Scripture denies not the increase of sanctification to be in part by works (which is all that the Papists hold) But accurseth

them that shall attribute Justification either in its beginning or growth (if there were any such thing) to works. 2 It is not true, that the Papists make whole or all Justification to consist in Sanctification. For in their many divisions and distinctions of Justification, among the rest they have this. There is a first and a second justification. The former of Infants and new Converts conferred in baptism. This consists in remission of sins meerly by the blood of Christ, sprinkled by the Spirit in Baptism upon Infants that are not of age actually to believe; and received also by Faith by believing Converts in their Baptism. The later end indeed they make to consist in the infusion of the habit of grace and sanctification: when the justified man, *ex justo justior fit*, is more and more justified. This will afterward be manifested: So that all Scholars must acknowledg Mr. *Br.* to have the *Tantundem*, and almost in every apex the *Idem* of this Doctrine. Yea worse is his doctrine in this particular than theirs. For he makes Sanctification and good works a Collateral with the righteousnes of Christ in justifying. They abandon this doctrine, teaching that they are but fruits of Gods grace and Christs merits. Thus he sets up vain man as Cheek-mate with Christ, they set him at his foot-stool, or appoint him to follow and apprehend the hemm of his garment, to draw vertue from him, though indeed to other and prouder ends then he hath ordained.

Br. *They quite overthrow and deny the most reall difference between the Old Covenant and the New; and making them in a manner one, I build upon the clear differencing and opening of the Covenants.*

1 All this is said, not shewed and proved. 2 If the Papists did wholly as he saith, Mr. Br. to every particle of what he charges them with, might tune up the Poets Epigram, *Jam sumus ergo pares: Jam sumus ergo pares.* In all this we shake hands. What fouler confounding of the Covenants can there be then what Mr. *Br* hath committed: when he makes *DO, and LIVE*, to be the voyce of both Covenants, denying any usefulnes to Faith it self in justifying, but as it is a deed and morall work. Let Babel it self be raked from end to end, there will not be found more confusion. The Papists say, doing and works, as works and doing cannot be our righteousnes to justifie us: But as they receive purification from the blood and grace of Christ, so they obtain acceptance with God, and becom our righteousnes to justifie us. Christ (say they) hath

hath merited that our fulfilling of the Law ſhould juſtifie us. Mr. Br. ſaith nay, but our fulfilling the works which the Law requireth, meriteth that we ſhould receive Chriſt to Juſtification (as we ſhall ſee by and by) Let now any rationall man judg which party doth moſt confound the Covenants, he that makes the works of the Law in and for themſelves, as they are ſimply done, meritorious to Juſtification: or they that aſcribe nothing to works but what they have from Chriſt. Both I acknowledg are to be abandoned; but the deeper grain of ſelf-extolling, the more ſenſuall luſting after the fleſh-pots of *Ægypt* is in Mr. *Brs.* Doctrine. Let none object that Mr. *Br.* attributes it not to works as works of the Law, but of the Goſpel; himſelf knoweth and hath learned that poor ſhift of the Papiſts; and that they come off handſomer with it upon their, then it is poſſible for him to do upon his principles.

Bax. 3. *They are ſottiſhly ignorant in the Doctrine of Juſtification* [*ſo am not I.*]

This I conceive he puts as a third difference between his and their doctrine. For what he ſaith under this third particular, that when they ſay juſtified, they mean ſanctified, that he had made before the firſt difference. If this be the difference, then is he much more guilty than they. *I obtained mercie, becauſe I did it of ignorance*, ſaith the Apoſtle, implying that they which did it maliciouſly againſt the light of their own underſtandings, were excluded from mercy. *He that knoweth his fathers will, and doth it not, ſhall be beaten with many ſtripes.* Yet I conceive Mr. *Br.* means here the Schoolmen of ancient times of Barbariſm: not the Jeſuits, Arminians, Socinians, and other Scholaſtick, Phyloſophick Theologaſters of theſe later times: For theſe are ſo knowing (in Mr. Brs. account) in the doctrine of Juſtification, that hee hath borrowed all his knowledg and doctrine from them. And why the former ſhould be eſteemed more ſottiſhly ignorant in this than in other no leſſe myſteriall doctrines of the Goſpel I know not. In things naturall and morall indeed they wrote as learned Philoſophers, ſo farr as refined reaſon could conduct them. But in things purely Evangelicall (ſaving about the perſons and natures of Chriſt, which they alſo handled more Metaphyſically than Theologically) beſides ſome fragments gathered out of *Auguſtine*, I could hardly ever meet with a ſound piece in ſuch of them as have come to my reading. There may be a time when Mr. *Br.* may recant his profit

and

and delight in dipping holy waters from the muddy ſtreams, contemning the pure fountain of the Goſpel.

Or if he puts the difference in the former words;

Bax. 3 *When they ſay we are juſtified by the works of the Goſpel, they mean onely that wee are ſanctified by works that follow Faith, and are beſtowed by Grace, they meriting our inherent Juſtice before God.*

And in that which ſtandeth as it were in a fourth place.

Bax. *They take our works to be part our legall, I take it only a part of our Evangelicall righteouſnes: or of the condition upon which Chriſts righteouſneſs ſhall be ours.*

Not to except here againſt his maimed alleadging of their opinions, thereby feigning a diſtance from them, that hee might allure his readers without ſuſpition to joyn as neer with them as himſelf: Let us take it for truth what he ſaith of them, and then let the indifferent Reader judg. 1 Whether is the moſt arrogant Doctrine, the Papiſts that ſay, works that follow, and are the fruits of Faith, and are done in the ſtrength of grace ſupernaturally infuſed into the ſoul do merit? or Mr. Br. that ſaith, works as concauſes with, not fruits of Faith, that flow from no other grace, but *Pelagius* his morall Suaſion, without any Phyſicall renovation and change upon the will (as for diſtinctions ſake ſome of our Divines are wont to expreſs themſelves) do ſo merit? If Mr. Br. mean any thing els by grace, he conceals it as a myſterie from us, and will not throughout his whole book give one hint at it: but makes man in his own naturall and morall qualifications, the meriter of his own Juſtification by Chriſt. 2 Or which aſcribes moſt to works, they that attribute to them inherent juſtice, which is the leſſer; or hee that aſcribes to them the meriting of Chriſts imputed righteouſnes, which is the greater? Concerning legall and Evangelicall Righteouſneſs, I have ſpoken enough before: And the phraſe of the Papiſts and Mr. Br. is one and the ſame herein.

This might ſuffice to take off this deluſion from his Readers, that his Doctrine is not Popiſh. But to manifeſt more fully in the ſight of the Sun, that every one may run reading it, and read it running, how groſly, and in how many particulars his Doctrine is Papiſticall, I ſhall draw out in a parallel his Doctrine, and the Doctrine of the Papiſts, ſetting them ſide by ſide, that whoſoever will, by comparing them may determine whether there be any

worſe

worse Popery from *Rome* it self than from *Kedderminster*. This I shall make the subject of the next Chapter.

CHAP. XVI.

The Doctrine of Mr. Baxter *and of the most Trentified and Jesuitized Papists, compared together in many particulars, and found one and the same.*

The Doctrine of the Papists and of Mr. Baxter *compared together in many particulars, in their Relation to Justification.*

PAPISTS.

Trident. Conc. Sess. 6. c. 6, 7, 8. Tilen. in Apol. p. 237. & in defens. Trid. Conc. adversus Chemnitii, part 1. Bell. justif. lib. 1. cap. 1

1. THere is a two-fold Justification, a first and a 2d. Justification: the one inchoate, unperfect, more properly to be termed the beginning or root of and a disposition to justification, or being justified, than Justification it self, or our being fully justified before God.

2 The first justification is by the first grace given, before all good works for the remission of sins for the meer merits of Christ to Infants by baptism, to them that are of Age by Faith. The second justification, is by new obedience and good works, by which the faithfull deserve increase of Righteousness to their fuller Justification.

Idem ibid.

BAXTER.

JUstification is two-fold, either in title of Law, or in sentence of Judgment. [In this later, having out-runn the Papists, to meet with them again, he looks back to the former, and makes it two-fold thus] Justification in title of Law is to be considered either in its first point & possession, or in its [after] continuance and accomplishment: The later he makes entire, & consequently (in the way of opposition there used) the former to be put in part, Aph. p. 302. 311.

The first point and possession of Justification I acknowledg to be by faith alone, without either the concomitancy or co-operation of works; for they cannot be performed in an instant.: But the continuance and accomplishment of Justification is not without the joynt procurement of obedience. Aphor. p. 302.

3 Good

Papists.	Baxter.
3 Good works are the condition of Justification, without which Christs satisfaction is not applyed to us. [*Of this opinion* Bellarmine *affirmeth some of his fellows to be, and finds no fault with it or them, onely himself takes up what seem'd to him more probable. Himself also speaks to the same purpose.*] The Gospel promising life upon condition of actuall & working Righteousness, which consists in keeping the Commandents.	*The righteousness of the New Covenant* [i. e. *in his sense, faith, and works*] *is the only condition of our interest in, and enjoyment of the Old.* [i. e. *of the righteousness of Christ to justification*] *Both these righteousnesses are absolutely necessary to salvation.* Aph. Thes. 17. 19. 60. and from thence every where untill the very end of his Book.
4 It is false therefore that we are justified by Faith onely, the Scriptures no where affirm it, let him be accursed that shall say it. Many other graces, vertues and works are required to it, *viz.* The fear of God, hope in his mercy, Love, Repentance, a desire to receive the Sacraments, a purpose to lead a new life, and keep the Commandements [*under this last speciall they comprize all good works whatsoever.*]	*The bare Act of beleeving is not the only Condition of the New Covenant, but severall other duties also are parts of that Condition. I desire no more of those that deny this, but that the Scripture may be judg. Whosoever shall reduce the contrary Doctrine into practice (viz. to seek salvation and Justification by faith only, not at al by works) it will undoubtedly damn him. Those other duties that justifie are Repentance, praying for pardon, forgiving others, Love, sincere obedience, works of Love (i. e. all good works) not faith alone, or some of these works and vertues with it, but all must have their concurrence to justifie,* Aphor. p. 235, 236, 237. 325.

Nay so far are both parties from this Faith, that Faith onely justifieth, that Both teach we are justified by Works only. For

5 We are justified by the Act of Faith, which is a work, and a Law, so that if we are not justified	*We are still said to be justified by Faith which is an Act of ours.* Append. p. 80. *Morall duties are part of*

Bel. l. 1. *de pu g* cap 14 *Sect.* 4. *Ratio.* 4.

Bell. lib. 4. *de Just.* c. 2.

Trid. Conc. in the forecited place.

Bell de Justif. lib 1. cap. 13, &c.

Bell. de Justif. lib. 1.

Papists.

flified by works, Faith it self must be excluded from justifying.

Deventria. So Pemble cites the Papists objecting. Treat. of justif. p. 37.

Though we are not justified by any works (*i. e.*) by any works of the Law, yet by a work of the Gospel, such as Faith is, we may be justified.

Bell. de necessitate operum ad salutem.

6 Our Adversaries (*i. e.* the Protestants) consent together in this, that good works are not necessary to salvation, otherwise than by the necessity of their presence, but that they have not any relation to salvation, as merits, or causes, or conditions thereof, *&c.* We contrariwise say that good works are necessary to a righteous man, unto salvation, by way of [causality or] efficiency, because [they effect] or work salvation.

See Weimarchius, l. 1. in Epist. ad Romanos, c. 3. p. 207.

7 When the Apostle saith, we are justified by Faith and not by Works, there is to be understood a Synecdoche in the words of *Paul*, that when he saith we are justified by Faith, hee meaneth [not without works, but] by Faith and works together, [*so that Faith is put for Faith, & works of Faith.*]

Osor. lib. 3. de Justit. n. 70.

Bel. lib. 4. de Justif. c. 10. Qu. de veritate bon. operum.

8 The good works of justified men [which effect their Justification]

Baxter.

of the condition of our salvation; and for it to be performed: And even faith is a Morall duty. [So that according to Mr. *Brs.* doctrine, Morall works and duties alone, as such, are required of us to Justification, and not Faith it self this way usefull, but as a morall work and duty, *Append.* p. 80.

When the Apostle saith [*by works and not by faith only*] *hee plainly makes them concomitant in procurement, or in that kind of Causality which they have: especially seeing he saith not* (*as he is commonly interpreted*) [*not by faith which is alone*] *but* [*not by faith onely.*] *In the phrase* [*Justified by works*] *the word* [*by*] *implyeth more than an idle concomitancy: If they should only stand by, while Faith doth all, it would not be said, we are justified by works,* Aph. p. 299, 300.

Faith in the largest sense, as it comprehendeth all the conditions of the N: C: is when a sinner, &c. doth believe the truth of the Gospell, and accept of Christ as his only Lord and Saviour, &c. and sincerely (*though imperfectly obey him as his Lord, forgiving others, loving his people, bearing all what sufferings are imposed, diligently using his Means and Ordinances, &c. And all this sincerely & to the end,* Aph. Thes. 70. & Aph. p. 243.

This personall Gospell-righteousnes is in its kind a perfect Righteousnes;

Papists.

cation] are absolutely just and in their Mode or manner, perfect.

9 So the perfection of our righteousnes and Justification is not from Faith but from works, For Faith doth but begin Justification, and afterward it hath assumed to it self Hope and Charity, it doth [by these] perfect it.

Bell. de Justif. lib. 1. cap. 20. Malden. in Matth. 9.

10 Good works merit without all doubt, yet not by any intrinsecall vertue and worth in themselves, but by vertue of Gods promise. A promise made with a condition of work, brings to pass that he which performs the work, is said to have merited the thing promised, and may challenge the reward as his debt in Law.

Bel. de Mer.

Yea all the Papists, as alleaged by *Cal. Inst. lib. 3 ca. 14. sect. 12. & cap. 17. sect. 3. 15.*

11 The Hereticks teach that it is unpossible for a righteous man to fullfill Gods Law. The Catholicks teach that it is absolutely possible for a righteous man to fullfill it, by the help of Gods Grace, and Spirit of Faith and Charity infused into them in their Justification.

Bell. lib. 4. de Justif. cap. 1.

12 The contrary doctrine which denyeth Justification by works, and the Merit of works is a pernicious

Hos. in Confut. pa. 140 lib. 3.

Baxter.

ousnes: and so far we may admit the doctrine of personall perfection. Aphor. *Thes.* 24.

The first point of Justification (and that which is but a point, the first point must needs be a very small pittance of it) I grant to be Faith alone, but the accōplishment (i.e. the perfitting thereof) is not without the joynt procaremēt of obedience, Aph. p. 302.

In a Larger sence as promise is an obligation, and the thing promised is called Debt; so the performers of the Condition are called worthy, and the thing promised is called Debt. Thes. 26. *Yea in this Meriting, the obligation to reward is Gods ordinate Justice, and the truth of his promise, and the worthiness lieth in our performance of the Condition on our part.* Aph. *pa.* 141.

As it was possible for Adam *to have fullfilled the Law of works, by that power which he had received by nature: So is it possible for us to fullfill the Conditions of the New Covenant* (i.e. the righteousnes which the Law requireth) *by the power which we receive from the Grace of Christ.* [*But whether this be grace or no grace* Pelagius *his imaginary, or the Gospel real grace, he wil not let us know, so that herein the Papists are more ingenious than he, for they express themselves plainly of effectuall Grace indeed.*] Thes. 27.

The Doctrine of Justification by Faith onely, tendeth to drive obedience out of the world; For if men

do

Papists.

Caniſ. impreſa in Andr. Vega Andr. Vega de Juſtif. in Epiſt. præfa. Oſor. de Juſtif. lib. 2, & 7.

nicious doctrine, an enemy to all good endeavours & good works, invites all to a licentiouſneſs of ſinning, and to tranſgreſs without fear or ſhame; what evil will he fear, or what good will he not deſpiſe, who thinks faith alone ſufficient to righteouſneſs?

Trident. Conc. Seſſ. 6. cap. 14, 16. & Seſſ. 14. cap. 8, 9. Bel. de Purgatorio. Bel. de Pœnit. lib. 4.

13 Though a man hath received the infuſion of grace, and the Spirit of Faith and Charity, and is now juſtified, yet he is under the penalty and curſe of the Law ſtill. For Chriſt hath given and God hath taken ſatisfaction onely for the fault, but not for the puniſhment, ſo that when God hath fully pardoned the fault, he may and will inflict the puniſhment upon the offender.

Bellarmine and all his fellows. Bel. de Juſtif. lib. 4. cap. 7. Syn. Trid. lib. cap. 12.

14 Yea this puniſhment remains upon the Juſtified both in life and death, and after death in Purgatory.

15 For the Righteous or Juſtified man is ſo under the obligation of Gods Law, that except he ſhall fulfill it, he ſhall not be ſaved.

Andr. Vega de Fide & operibus q. 2 So alſo Thomas Scotus & Bellarmine.

16 Becauſe our Juſtification being ſtill conditionall, even after we are Juſtified, may be ſomtimes loſt, ſomtimes received, now had, and then loſt, and after recovered yea and loſt again, as we do hinder or not hinder the Grace of God.

17 No man can be aſſured of his eternall Election, that he is ordeined

Baxter.

do once beleeve, that it is not ſo much as a part of the Condition of their Juſtification, will it not much tend to relax their diligence? And it doth much confirm the world in their Soul-cozening Faith, &c. Aphor. *pag.* 325, 326.

It was not the intent of the Father or Son, that by this ſatisfaction the offenders ſhould be immediately delivered from the whole Curſe of the Law, and freed from the evill which they had brought upon themſelves, but ſome part muſt be executed in ſoul and body, and remain upon them at the pleaſure of Chriſt: And this Curſe is upon not onely offenders in generall, but alſo upon the Elect, and beleevers. Aph. *p.* 65, 66, 68.

Not till the day of Reſurrection & Judgement will all the effects of Sin and Law & wrath be perfectly removed [*from the beleevers & juſtified.*]

Beleevers after they be juſtified, are under the Law as it is a Covenant of works, [*for life and death.*] Aph. *p.* 78, 79. 82.

Onely a conditionall but not an abſolute diſcharge is granted to any in this life. When we do perform the condition yet ſtill the diſcharge remains conditionall, till we have quite finiſhed our performance, and where the condition is not performed the law is ſtill in force & ſhall be executed, A. *p.* 82.

[*The juſtification of beleevers in this life is conditionall,* ut ſupra, &]

Papists.

Bellarmine prosecuteth this Argument at large.

deined of God to life; or of his perseverance in grace to the end; and consequently not of his salvation. For the Scripture in expres words teacheth, that Salvation depends of the condition of works; But no man can certainly conclude that he shall do [much less persevere to do] all that Christ hath Commanded.

18 It cannot be that the Righteousnes of Christ be imputed to us in that sense that by it we may be called, and be formally righteous; although it be true that Christs merits be imputed to us, because God hath made them ours by donation, and we may offer them to God the Father for our sinns, because Christ hath taken upon him the burthen of making satisfaction for us, and of reconciling us to God the Father: yet the denomination of righteous persons is from the intrinsecall righteousnes in themselves.

Bel. de justif. Lib. 1.

This is the generall vote of all Popish writers, none excepted.

19 Though we are justified by the works which the Law commandeth, yet are we not justified by them as they are works of the Law; but as they are Evangelicall

Baxter.

Men that are but thus conditionally pardoned and justified, may be unpardoned and unjustified again, for their non-performance of the conditions, and all the debt so forgiven, be required at their hands. [so that there can be no certainty of perseverance to salvation.] Aph. *Thes.* 44. He seems in the explication to lenifie his assertion, but to it I have spoken before.

Our Legall Righteousnes is not personal or in our selves, and in our own qualificatiõs & actions &c. but wholly without us in Christ: Our Evangelicall Righteousnes consisteth in our own Actions of Faith & Gospel obedience. This is the onely Condition of our interest in the Righteousnes of Christ. Now by reason of this personall righteousnes consisting in the Rectitude of their own dispositions and actions, the godly are called Righteous in Scripture, and their faith and duties are said to pleas God, viz. as they are related to the Covenant of grace, i.e. as they are cõditions procuring our Justification by Christ; [*as well as in regard of the imputed Righteousnes,*] which he addeth but as a cypher, bringing no proof for it but all seemingly for the former, *Apbor. Thes.* 18, 19, 20, 22, *and its explication*, p. 119. &c.

We are justified by works commanded in the Law, yet as they make up not our Legall but our Evangelicall Righteousnes, not as they are done upon legall terms, but as they are conditions

Papists.

call and works of the Gospel, done in the strength of Christ, and by the power of renewing grace powred upon the Elect by Christ under the Gospel.

The common Tenet of Papists.

20 Love or Charity is the form of Justifying Faith, so that when faith doth Justifie, it justifieth by charity as its form which gives it its life and motion; so that if Faith justifieth, love justifieth either in an equality with it, or more than it.

This also is a known Tenet among the Papists.

21 Justifying Faith consisteth in the Assent of the judgement to all things which are written in the word of God: No other faith is required of any. But an implicit Faith is sufficient in the Laity and ignorant, which are not acquainted with the Scriptures, in whom it is enough to beleeve as the Church beleeveth, *i.e.* as their Clergy teacheth and beleeveth, though they do not explicitly and in particulars know what the Church beleeveth.

Baxter.

ditions of the New Covenant. This is the chief substance of Mr *Brs* whole book; and it is a poorer shift to elude the doctrine of *Paul*, than is that of the Papists.

Love is an essentiall part of Justifying Faith, & not properly a fruit of of it. Aph. p 266. *When Faith therefore* [*not love*] *is said to justifie, it is said so to work* (*in its essentiall work of accepting*) *by Love,* pa. 268. *That both are necessary to salvation, & are concurrent in apprehending Christ, is doubtless.* p 271. *Love doth truly receive Christ* &c. p. 224.

The people are to understand, that for them to take upon trust from their Teachers, what they cannot yet reach to see in its own evidence, is less absurd and more necessary, than many do imagin. Epistle to the reader in the last page save two.

These may suffice for a Taste by which the reader may judge, whether Mr. *Brs* and the Papists Barrells are filled with the same Herring, or not. Should I proceed to Compare also his and their equivocations, ambiguities, & mentall reservations, together with their purposed and not unwary Contradictions, when to say and deny the same thing in severall places, as may severally make for their advantage: But specially if I should go on to Compare them, how they bring the same arguments to prove their severall assertions, and the same distinctions and other shifts of Sophistry to elude the Scriptures

tures and reasons which make againſt them; I ſhould *procedere ad infinitum* almoſt, begin but finde no end.

In alleaging the words of the ſeverall Authors, ſomething here and there hath perhaps been abbreviated, ſome words (ſtanding as cyphers without waight in reference to the queſtions Controverted) interſerted, to make up ſome orderly Connexion of the following with the foregoing particular cited: But no where have I wittingly Committed any ſuch alteration of the words as to alter in one Title the ſenſe of the Writer; as will be evident to all that will but take the paine to examine the citations with their authentique or books from which they are cited.

Neither is there any one thing alleaged in which the two parties Cohere, but what hath been ſtill Controverted between the Papiſts and Proteſtants. Elſe would it be eaſie to produce a thouſand particulars wherein the Pope and *Luther* themſelves ſpeak one and the ſame thing without oppoſition or difference.

If any where, when Mr. *Br* and the Papiſts ſpeak the ſame words, yet Mr. *Br* means not punctually the ſame thing with the Papiſts, in every ſuch allegation I undertake to manifeſt that he is worſe and delivers more ſelf-exalting, & Grace-depreſſing doctrine than they.

Yet all this is too little to ſet forth the frame of Mr. *Br*'s ſpirit: he may take himſelf injured, and left too obſcure, if he be but matched with the Papiſts, and have no pre-eminence granted him before and above them in exalting mans righteouſnes, and nullifying the Grace of God in Chriſt. That we may not rob him of the praiſe to which his ambition ſeems to aſpire, we will grant to him, that the Papiſts are but the Pigmies, and he the Giant: that in the battell between *Michael* and the *Dragon* he hath ſuperexcelled, & more deſerved the Scarlet Hat, Miter, Croſier, yea Triple Crown it ſelf, than they that have and wear them; if not by his Art yet at leaſt by his daring boldnes in his undertakings. This ſervice therefore I ſhall do him, to manifeſt not onely his equality with but alſo his exuperancy above many of the famous Champions of *Rome*. That many of the brave Cardinals, Biſhops, Jeſuits, and Fryars, of the Church of *Rome* are Proteſtants in the poynt of Juſtification, as compared with Mr. *Br*: and that he ſheweth himſelf in many particulars about this doctrine, a Papiſt of a deeper dye than the more modeſt Papiſts, yea than ſome of the moſt Jeſuitized and Trentified Rabbi's among them. This ſhall be the buſineſs of the next Chapter.

CHAP. 17.

CHAP. XVII.

A comparing of Mr. Baxters *Doctrine with the Doctrine of some of the more Modest, and other more Trentified and Jesuitized Papists, in which he is found more Antichristian than they.*

Papists.

1 IT is to be noted that the Scripture attributeth this imputation of Righteousnes to no other thing but Faith.

Cardinall *Cornarenus in Rom. 4.*

2 Faith hath not of it self any efficacy, as it is our act, to forgive and reconcile: but all its vertue proceeds from its object, namely Christ, whose vertue and merit God hath disposed to apply to the sinner unto Justification, by Faith on him.

Toletus a defense, upon Rom. 3.

3 If it be enquired how the Law of Faith is distinguished by *Paul* against the Law of works, even of morall works, when Faith also is comprehended under the genus [or kind] of works; for to beleeve is our work: The solution is, that to beleeve in him that justifieth the ungodly, leaneth upon the Righteousnes of another, to wit, of God through Christ: but other works do lean upon their own Righteousnes; every work is in [or after] it self good,

Cardinall *Cajetan upon Rom. 3.*

Baxter.

THe bare act of beleeving is not the onely condition of the New Covenant, but severall other duties also are parts of that Condition. The Common opinion that justifying faith, as justifying, doth consist in any one single act, is a Wretched Mistake. [by the one act of faith he means, Faith in opposition to works.] *Aph.* p. 235, 248.

Faith it self is our righteousnesse, viz. our Evangelicall, as Christ is our Legall Righteousnesse. It self is imputed to us for righteousnesse, Aph. p. 125, 126. *It justifieth as it is an act of ours, and as it is a morall duty,* App. p. 80. & 102.

Both Faith and workes make up one condition, one righteousnes, one perfect righteousnes of our own, by which we merit to be justified by God by the legall righteousnes which is in Christ. [And consequently Faith doth not lean upon anothers, and works upon their own righteousnes, but both make up one compounded righteousnes and goodnes which make us righteous and good also, and by this righteousnes and goodnes, deservers of justification & salva-

Papists.

good, and makes him good that hath it.

4 If Faith as it is a certain Act, and of it self, should procure Righteousness, then were not Righteousness given freely. God hath not used works to justifie, as he hath used Faith, that men should not boast, attributing Righteousness to the vertue or merit of works.

Toletus the Iesuit up on *Rom.* 1.

5 Faith is not counted to us for Righteousness, as if it self were made our Righteousness; but because it brings a Righteousness on man before God; not as it is an act of man, then Grace should be of works, for to beleeve is a kind of work: but of Gods will, as he hath willed that Righteousness should be given to man by Faith, and the vertue of Christ upon whom man beleeveth, should be communicated to the beleever. This is to count [or impute] Faith to Righteousness before God.

Idem in *Rom.* 4.

6 Whereas we attain a two-fold Righteousness by Faith, an inherent Righteousness, &c. by which we become partakers of Gods nature; and the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, &c.

Baxter.

salvation.] *Aph. Thes.* 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26. and scatteringly throughout the whole Book.

Faith as an act of ours, and of it self, with other workes, procureth Righteousnes: And God hath used works to justifie as he hath used faith, even in the same kinde of causality. [So we have found Mr. *Br.* oft affirming as may be seen in our former quotations: Let him deny that he holds the consequents of these two Antecedents, if he will.]

It is so far from being an error to affirm that Faith it self is our righteousnes, that it is a truth necessary for every Christian to know, yea it both is our Righteousnesse, and is imputed to us for righteousnesse. The [*very*] *personall performance of faith shall be imputed to us, for a sufficient personall payment* [*of righteousnes*] *as if we had paid the full* [*duty and righteousnesse which the Law requireth.*] This is the substance of his words, though not his very words, which being continued in terms of a Metaphor, cannot without the citing of the whole similitude be expressed to the understanding, otherwise, *Aphor.* p. 125, 126, 129.

There is a two-fold righteousnesse attainable by Christ [at least in words] *the one an inherent righteousnesse in our selves, consisting in the seed and acts of Faith, Love, Holinesse,* &c. *the other in Christ, but male*

Papists.

&c. It remains to be enquired, upon which of these we ought to lean [or trust] and to account our selves justified before God? My judgment is that we are to rest, to rest I say as upon a stable thing that firmly susteineth, namely the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and not on the holiness and grace inherent in our selves. For this is unperfect, &c. therefore we cannot for it be counted Righteous before God. But the imputed righteousness of Christ is a perfect righteousnes, in which there is nothing that can offend the eyes of God, but all things that can abundantly please him. *Upon this alone* therefore are we to rest as upon a thing sure and stable, and to beleeve that by it alone we are justified.

Cavarenus Card. in Tractat. de Justif.

7 This may undoubtedly be affirmed, and it is the opinion of all Divines, that God can justifie men and make them pleasing and amiable to him, without any inherent quality or habits infused.

Medina in 12. Qu. 110. a. 2, 4.

8 *To the same purpose and somewhat more fully speaketh Bellarmine.* The guilt or obligation to punishment (*saith he*) may be taken away without the infusion of Righteousnee. For nothing hinders by how much the less God

Bell. de Justif. lib. 1. cap. 16.

Baxter.

made over to beleevers, by God's Donation if not imputation. Both of these are absolutely necessary to salvation, neither is the one perfect and the other unperfect, as to justification, but the inherent perfect in its kinde as well as the imputed, so that both in their kinds of causality are to be rested on as things sure to support us to justification before God: and we are as truly justified by and for the inherent as the imputed righteousnesse, if the righteousnesse which is in Christ meriteth a possibility of the justification of a sinner before God, he must by his inherent and actuall righteousnesse merit the actuall application of Christs righteousnesse, and justification by it, else he cannot be justified. [Mr. *Br* cannot deny every particle of this doctrine to be his own in words at length, & that hath been already manifested in those former & these latter quotations.]

The inherent righteousnesse is absolutely necessary to salvation, Aph. Thes. 17. [Otherwise justification from eternity also would peep in, and then *Actum est*, &c. And if absolutely necessary, how can God justifie without it?]

Manum a tabula, this is enough to wipe out *Bellarmine* from Mr. *Brs* Kalender of Saints. A whole ile of Salt is too little to season this passage. *It overthrowes the great Goddesse Condition so pretious to* Mr. *Br. and erects that Image of*

Papists.

God can will the not ordeining to punishment, and the pardoning of the offence, and the not accounting him for an enemy, to whom he hath not granted the gift of habituall Righteousnesse.

Cajetan on Iames.

9 The Scope of *James* (in the second Chapter of his Epistle) is to shew that we are justified not by a barren but by a fruitfull Faith.

Cajetan ibidem.

10 The meaning of *James* is not that Faith without works is dead, &c. For it is evident that we are justified by Faith even without works. But his meaning is, that Faith without works, that is which refuseth to work, or is not disposed to work, is a dead Faith, vain and justifieth not. What therefore *James* alleageth out of *Gen.* 15. *Abraham beleeved God*, to this purpose he alleageth it, that he beleeved being in readiness to work. Therefore he saith that in the work of offering his Son, the Scripture was fulfilled, speaking of his Faith prepared to work: It was fulfilled (I say) as to the execution of that great work, to which his Faith was prepared.

Salmeron cap. 2. Iac.

11 If any where in Scripture thou heares reward or wages promised, know that it is no otherwise due then by Gods promise,

Baxter.

Iealousie in its place, justification an immanent act in God. For if God may justifie where there is no infused righteousnesse, where then is the condition? Then is the justification in God, and not termined on the Conscience of the justified: but Bellarmine *hath his time to deny it again, els* Actum esse de Amicitia.

Except apparent violence be used with this Chapter, &c. *it cannot be doubted but that a man is justified by works and not by Faith onely,* Thes. 75.

James *saith that Faith is dead being alone, because it is dead to the use and purpose of justifying, For in it self it hath a life according to its quality still,* &c. *And so works make Faith alive, as to the attainment of its end, justification. Works therefore justifie (not onely proving our Faith to be sound, but) themselves being in the obligation as well as Faith, and in the same kind of causality and procurement with Faith, though not in equality with it, which I prove thus. When it is said we are justified by works, the word* [*by*] *implyeth more then an idle concomitancy,* &c. *as I have before alledged him,* p. 229, 230.

Mr. B. makes the promise of God an obligation by which God is bound to man, so that man may challenge God for debt; pronouncing the performer

Papists.

mise, freely he hath promised, freely he gives. If thou wilt abide in his Grace and Favour, make no mention of thy Merits.

Fryar Feur on Mat. 20.1.

12 All Papists consentingly make the Merits of Christ the foundation of mans merits, as far as he can merit. Neither Faith nor works, nor doing nor sufferings (say they) have any other vertue to merit then what they receive from the merits of Christs death, then as they are dipt in his blood; this makes them acceptable to the Father.

13 When Christ saith of the woman, *Luk.* 7. 47. *Many sins are forgiven her, for she loved much*; it is to be understood not that she loved much, and so her much love was the cause of her great forgiveness, but contrarywise that because many sins were forgiven her, therefore she loved much.

Soarez Bishop on the place.

14 To be given freely, and to be a retribution to works, are as much opposit, as that which is free and that which is from Justice, or as not due, and debt. And this way of inference the Apostle useth in the beginning of this 4th Chapter

Salmero disp. 39. ad Rom.

Baxter.

formers worthy, & their performances merit. Yea scarce admits of any one drop of Gods blessings to discend upon the good or bad which he ascribes not to some kind of mans merits, Aph. p. 137—141.

"*Mr.* B. contrariwise ascribes "all the meritorious vertue of "mans works to their own righ- "teousnes, leaving man so long "naked of the righteousnes "which is by Christ, untill he hath by "his own strong indeavours me- "rited it: so that according to "his doctrine, the application of "Christs merits to any is the "fruit of that mans merits, and "not the mans merits the fruit "of Christs merits: this is cleer, "from the former allegations.

M. Br. interprets it the con- "trary way, *Aph.* p. 236. as the "understanding Reader will easi- "ly perceive. [Let all judge that "have but a mite of reason, whe- "ther this man hath any awe of "the Scripture which so abuseth "it, yet cries out upon others as "faulty. *To use his own words, he may as well make a Creed of his own, whatsoever the word saith to the contrary.*

There is no such opposition, Justi- "fication is from the ordinate "justice of God, and the fruit of "the merit of our righteousnes: "yet a free gift of free grace ne- "vertheless. *So he declares his judgment in the fore-cited places.*

Papists.

Chapter [*viz.* speaking of Justification by Grace.]

15 The work of Justice is wages or Reward, and this way of Justice Grace excludeth, whose work is meer gift or Donation.

Dominicus a Soto in Rom. 4.

16 In this verse the Apostle concludeth that Christ hath saved us from all the evill both of fault and punishment. That there is nothing of condemnation remaining to them that are in Christ, because all judgment is taken away both to the fault and the punishment.

Soto, Salmero, & Aquinas upon Ro 8.1.

17 It is certain that when originall sin is remited, that the evils which it brought are not remitted and taken away, as all finde by experience: Notwithstanding they remain not under the consideration of punishment, because the fault being taken away, there can be no desert, as to punishment, remaining.

Vasquez in 3. *Thō. disp.* 156. *cap.* 3. *de pœnalitatibus.*

18 *I will remember their iniquities no more*, saith the Lord, *i. e.* I will neither in this world injoin any Penance for them, nor in that which is to come inflict any punishment for them. So hath the Holy Ghost promised that our sins shall be forgiven by the New Covenant of Grace.

Anselm.

19 In regard of the uncertainty of our own righteousnes, and the danger of vain glory: it is most

Bellarmine.

Baxter.

"Mr. *Br.* directly teacheth the "contrary doctrine throughout "his Book, every where solving "the absurdity of his doctrine "by his conditions.

"Nay he hath not so saved & "freed us from the punishment "and curse, but that they that "are in Christ must bear it both "in soul and body. *As his alledged words before declare.*

"Mr *B.* asserts the contrary "doctrine, and propugneth it "with ten Arguments, which "have been examined in the first "part of this Tractate.

"Nay the beleevers sins tho "pardoned, yet are but conditi-"onally pardoned; so that they "are still in Gods remembrance "to inflict the curse and punish-"ment of the Law upon them, as "the curse, in life and death, gi-"ving them no full discharge till "the day of judgment. *The place hath been cited before.*

"So to repose our confidence "on sole mercy and grace, is a "soul-cozening Faith, *Aph.* p. 326.

most safe to repose our whole confidence in the sole mercy and benignity of God.

"326. He must be undoubtedly "damned that doth not work "and obey to be justified and sa- "ved by, and for his obedience "and works, *ibid.* p. 325. com- "pared with p. 300. & 320.

Let now not only Schollars, to whom Mr *Br* appealeth to judg of his freedom from Popery, but with them all rationall and conscientious men give their verdict, whether he be not so cleer as *Pilate* when he had washed his hands, was from the blood of Christ: and whether the better Divinity come from *Rome*, or from *Kederminster*.

Chap. XVIII.

Whether Mr. Baxters *Plea here be of sufficiency to prove his Doctrine free from Socinianism.*

THe second aspersion of infamy, from which he endeavours to vindicate his doctrine is *Socinianism:* This hee goeth about to do in these words:

Bax. p. 306. *But what difference is there betwixt it and the Socinian doctrine of Justification?* Answ. *In some mens mouths, Socinianism is but a word of reproach, or a stone to throw at the head of any man that saith not as they. Mr.* Wotton *is a Socinian, and Mr.* Bradshaw, *and Mr.* Gataker, *and Mr.* Goodwin, *and why not* Piscator, Pareus, *&c. if some zealous Divines know what* Socinianism *is. But I had rather study what is Scripture-truth than what is Socinianism. I do not think that* Faustus *was so infaustus as to hold nothing true. That wch he held according to Scripture is not* Socinianism. *For my part I have read little of their writings, but that little gave me enough, and made me cast them away with abhorrence. In a word, The Socinians acknowledg not that Christ had satisfied the Law for us, & consequently is none of our legall righteousness, but only hath set us a Copie to write after, and is become our pattern, and that we are justified by following him as a Captain and guide to heaven; and so all our proper Righteousness is in this Obedience. Most accursed Doctrine! so far am I from this, that I say, The Righteousnesse*

ouſneſs which we muſt plead againſt the Laws Accuſation, is not one grain of it in our Faith or Works, but all out of us in Chriſts ſatisfaction. Only our Faith, Repentance, and ſincere Obedience are the conditions upon which wee muſt partake of the former: And yet ſuch conditions as Chriſt worketh in us frely by his Spirit.

How forcible and unreſiſtible is the power of Conſcience, flying in the face of the guilty, and accuſing where men applaud, or at leaſt hold their peace? Who either of men or Angels could have charged Mr. *Br.* for ſaying that which he had not yet ſaid? or for venting Socinian Doctrine in his writings before he had yet written? What none els can do, M. *Br.* is forced by Conſcience to do againſt himſelf: to arraign himſelf at the Bar for *Socinianiſm.* Conſcience is the accuſer, what Patron will he retein to be his defender? Nothing out of himſelf can ſuffice to anſwer an accuſer within himſelf: Therefore he fees Reaſon, that is his ſophiſticated, and ſopiſticall wit, art, and craft, to plead his Cauſe againſt Conſcience.

The firſt of theſe exceptions which theſe make for him againſt the Charge, is the abuſe which ſome make of this imputation, laying it upon all that ſpeak not as they.

But 1. This is beſides the Charge: Theſe ſome had not then ſpoken againſt Mr. *Br.* it is the accuſation of his own conſcience which he ſhould have anſwered, and he knows it not to have confederated with thoſe ſome of whom he ſpeaketh.

2. I know none of thoſe ſome that have layd that aſperſion upon any of thoſe Divines which he mentioneth ſave one; and that one I ſuppoſe would be very angry with any other man in *England* (M. *Br.* alone excepted) that ſhould go about to rob him of that honour which Mr. *Br.* calls a reproach. It is for brotherhoods-ſake that he bears it from him.

3. But his craft herein is to befool his Readers with an opinion that he is of the ſame judgment with *Pareus, Wotton, Gataker,* &c. of whom they that are dead have as much ſhewed their abhorrency from, and oppoſition againſt his Doctrines, as any that have lived upon earth. And thoſe that are living, if they be conſiſtent with themſelves in their former writings (whereof I nothing doubt,) are as far from Mr *Br.* as he is from Chriſt and his truth.

4. His ſeer that he caſteth upon them that are Adverſaries to his Doctrine, terming them Zealous Divines, inſinuating that they have

have zeale without knowledg and learning, I leave as proper to him that in that way of wisdom and righteousnes which his own reason either as refined with Philosophy, or corrupted with Sophistry suggesteth, seeks for justification and eternall glory. Let us be accounted fools to the world, and no bodies in that which is falsly called science, so that we may be wise in, and zealous for that which is the power and wisedom of God to salvation.

The second Plea which he makes for himself is the singlenes and sincerity of his studies, bent rather to seek out *what is Scripture truth than what is Socinianism*, & that he thinks that *Socinus* his Nature, Studies, and Attainments did not so much vary from his name. *Faustus, the happy, that he should be so unhappy as to hold not bing true:* and consequently that neither himself is so unhappy, but that he hath learned some Truths from this happy *Socinus*, and perhaps such as he could never learn from Christ, his Apostles, or faithfull Ministers.

Bnt 1. This may be said of *Faustus* the Conjurer, who by giving himself to the Devill, did not exterminate all notions of all truths from his soul. Will Mr *Br.* be his Disciple also? Both had the like effectuall influence from Satan, neither know I which to prefer.

2. Who sent Mr. *Br.* to learn from such Teachers? to seek for light in darknes, or Heaven in Hell, or Scripture-Truth, in the precept of Pagans, or glosses of Papists, or *Socinus* his God Reason? *Is it not because there is no God in Israel, that he goes to enquire of Baal-zebab the God of Ekron?* 2 King. 1. 3. *The Lord Jesus rebuketh, silenceth, and refuseth to hear the Spirit of lies, even when hee speaks truth,* Mar. 1. 23, 24, 25. *and abandoneth the spirituall Devil no less than if he had blasphemed,* Mat. 4. So also *Paul,* Acts 16. 16--18. The truth of Christ needs not any, disdains all props from Hell to sustain it. He that will not dip from the fountain, but at the pools which the unclean beasts have defiled, let him without our envy have mudd and dung enough in the water which he drinketh.

3. It is much to be doubted the mans heart deceives him. Were his studie so unfeigned and serious to know what is *Scripture truth,* he would more study the Scripture it self, and less *Bellarmin, Socinus, Arminius,* and such like Sophisters, whose whole study it is to corrupt all, and to leave no Scripture unperverted.

4. Had he not ploughed with *Socinus* his Heyfers (or rather Bulls) he could never have sowed so much darnell in the field of Christ.

The

The third Plea which he bringeth to prove that his Doctrine is free from Socinianism is, because there is one point wherein hee dissenteth from *Socinus*. That *Socinus* and his followers deny any expiatory sacrifice that Christ hath offred to God to satisfie his Justice for our sins; or that ther is any effectual vertue in *Christs* death to purge our Consciences from dead works. But that he becomes our Saviour only in this, that [he hath given us more perfect precepts of Righteousnes than were contained in the Law and the Prophets, and withall he] hath given us a Copie or pattern by his own practice to which we must be conformed: And so we must be justified (not by the blood of Christ, but) by our own obedience in following these precepts and this pattern which he hath given us. In this point Mr. *Br.* professeth himself so farr from joyning with him, that hee casteth off this Doctrine with abhorrence.

But this reasoning hath no soundnes in it: For

1 It is the same, as if I should argue, that *Goliah* was not of the race of the Giants, because he had not upon each hand six fingers, and upon each foot six toes, at some of the Giants progeny had, and possibly the Giant himself. Or that Mr. *Br.* should seek by this Argument to prove himself no English-man, because he dwels neerer the Severn than Thames. So also might the Jews elude the words of Christ, and *Elymas* the words of *Paul*, as slanderous, arguing themselves not to be the children of the Devill, because they had flesh and bone, so had not the Devill. They had never carried Christ aloft, and set him on a pinacle of the Temple (fearing they might fall headlong thence themselves) so had the Devill. The seed, the Lusts of the Devil abiding and reigning in them, spake them out to be children of the Devill, though they brake not out in them into every particular Act as in the Devill. The utmost that M. Br. can from such premisses conclude is, that (though in many things els it be, yet) in this one his Doctrine is not aspersed with *Socinianism*.

2. I think it will not be objected by any to M. *Br.* that he is ambitious in all things to be a Socinian, but in such only wherein the *Socinians* are most subtle Sophisters than the Jesuites, and doe bring more shew of sophisticated reason to exalt Popery than the Papists themselves, and with greater plausibility and craft do pervert the truth and simplicity of the Gospel, more extolling mans pride, and more nullifying Gods grace, than any of the Champi-

ons

ons of the Pope had either the wit or the audacity to do untill these had taught them. If then in the before-mentioned point hee holds not with *Socinus*, no marvell, for then should he have relinquished the Papists. I do not think that his wits do run in Pilgrimage to *Racovia*, upon any other grounds but in love to *Rome*, and in abhorrence of free Jerusalem, *Gal.* 4. 26.

3. Hee should have cleered (if hee could) his Doctrine from other peeces of Socinianism, which he knows it guilty of, & would be objected against him. As 1. His *To Credere*, or Act of believing, justifying a sinner 2. All other works of obedience, as our Acts or works, justifying in an equality, and in the same manner with Faith (without mentioning any vertue that they have from the death of Christ to this end, as the Papists teach, but rather that Christ fetcheth vertue from these to justifie:) 3 His doctrine of Gods dispensing with, and relaxing of his Law. To which I might add in the 4th. place, his canonizing and almost deifying Reason, and that without any adject of (renewed or spiritualliz̃ed, even of) naturall and sophisticall reason, to which he doth so frequently in his book almost sacrifice as to the sole and sufficient Judg of the Scriptures, and guide unto salvation. These things he cannot deny to be originally from *Socinus*, though probably brought home to him by other dirty Channels, and not dipt from the spring or rather puddle it self. It is but a vain piece of his sophistry to defend himself where none will accuse, and to hide himself in the dark, where ke knows he should meet with opposition and accusation.

4 He professeth himself to be but yet a puny in the School of *Socinus*, hath read but little of their doctrine, yet is much sowred with the Leaven thereof, when hee hath more fully tryed the quaintnes & depth of their sophistry (in which his soul delighteth more than in the plainnes & foolishnes of the Gospel) who knoweth whether he may not, following such a guide as reasõ, at length also sup up with pleasure what now he casteth off with defiance? the Apost. speaks somthing that may put us in fear of it, 2 *Tim.* 3. 13.

5 Even this error of *Socinus* against which in speciall he protesteth his abhorrence, he doth in generall maintain with as strong a Front as any of the Socinians. They say that Christ offereth salvation to all, but it is every particular mans particular faith and obedience, their actuall believing and obeying, following his precepts and treading in his steps to the end, that in the end makes

him to be actually and effectually a Saviour to them. And this is the ſum and full dimenſion of Mr. *Brs.* doctrine. Only they make Chriſt the Prophet chiefly, but this man Chriſt as Prieſt and King, to be the Saviour. In this they both agree, that except we by our own righteouſneſſ become ſelf-Saviours, we ſhall have no ſalvation by him.

What elſe he hath in this Section for the vindicating, yea magnifying of his doctrine, hath been oft ſpoken to already, and will a little after be examined again, where hee uſeth the *Tantundem*, though not literally the *Idem* of theſe words, to apologize for his doctrine againſt other crimes imputable to it.

CHAP. XIX.

Mr. Baxters *firſt Reaſon examined, by which he endeavours to evince his Doctrine not to be repugnant to* Pauls, *viz. that* Pauls *queſtion in his Epiſtles, and his queſtion in his Aphoriſms, are not one but divers.* Pauls *queſtion, what is that proper Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified from the laws malediction, which the Apoſtle concludeth to be Chriſts ſatisfaction only. But Mr.* Brs. *and St.* Iames *his queſtion, what is the condition of this Juſtification by Chriſts Righteouſnes, whether Faith alone, or works alſo?*

WEe have examined what he hath to ſay for the vindicating of his Doctrine from Popery and Socinianiſm: we expected alſo that hee ſhould in the next place have ſhewed, or at leaſt pretended ſome diſtance between him and the *Arminians:* But it ſeems he glories in it as his Crown to be reputed one of their part. Therefore leaving this, he undertakes a greater Task, an Herculean Labour in his third diſpute of this kind, *viz.* to cleer his doctrine from all oppoſition to *Paul* and the Scriptures. This is a work indeed, which if hee diſcharge honourably, and full up to what he promiſeth, all will grant him the Lawrell above all the Angelical and Seraphical Divines that have in any age made uſe of ink and paper. It is the ſole thing that we long after for ſatisfaction. Let him bleſs us with ſound demonſtrations to prove it, wee ſhall all run after him: And though ſome madd men may term

term us Papists, Socinians, Arminians, or whatsoever else, we shal gladly bear it to become his Disciples. All what else he hath said would be superfluous to every conscientious man. This alone would win him: But how poorly and Pigmie-like this supposed Giant dischargeth this bold adventure, let his owne words declare.

B. p. 307, &c. *Lastly, let us see whether S.* Paul, *or any other Scripture do contract (I thinke it should be printed* [*do contradict*]*) this. And for my part I know no one word in the Bible that hath any strong appearance of contradiction to it. The usuall places quoted are these,* Rom. 3. 28. & 4. 2, 3, 14, 15, 16. Gal. 2. 16. & 3. 21, 22. Eph. 2. 8, 9. Phil. 3. 8, 9. *In all which, and in all other the like places you shall easily perceive,* 1 *That the Apostles dispute is upon this question, what is the Righteousnes which we must plead against the accusation of the Law? or by which we are justified as by the proper Righteousnes of that Law? And this he well concludeth, is neither works nor Faith, but the Righteousnes which is by Faith, that is Christs Righteousnes.*

But now St. James *his question is, what is the condition of our Justification by this Righteousnes of Christ? whether Faith onely? or works also?*

This is the first part of this his Dispute: Let us examine what force it hath to the end for which he useth it, whether it reconciles *Paul* to Mr Br. or shew they never contradicted one the other?

1 *He tells us he knows no one word in St.* Paul *or the Bible, that hath any strong appearance of contradiction to his Doctrine.* To which I answer,

1 That wee look not to appearances whether they be weak or strong: But if there be not strong Contradictions in the doctrine of the Apostle, and of the Gospel to his, there is no cause of dissenting from him.

2 Who more blind and ignorant than hee that will not know and see?

3 No marvail if hee see not while hee looks thorow the spectacles of Naturall reason and sophisticall reasonings, whereas *spirituall things cannot be discerned but spiritually,* 1 Cor. 2. 14.

4 Let him examine whether the words of Christ be not verified upon him. *For judgment I am come into the world, that they which see not might see, and they which see might be made blind,* Joh. 9. 39. But

blessed be God who hath hid these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them to babes, Mat. 11. 25.

5 If he see not, know not, his wilful ignorance and blindnesse must not be made the rule of other mens Faith and Judgment, nor prejudice their happiness in seeing and knowing. It is somewhat a lofty language, he knoweth not. What then? Therefore either there is no such thing, or no man can know it, or it is a fancy in any other to believe it. Not Mr. *Br.* but Christ is our *ipse dixit*, wee draw the Treasures of wisedom and knowledg from Christ, not from Mr. *Br.*

2 Hee acknowledgeth that other men at least seem to know what he denies himself to know, Scriptures that have (if not a strong, yet) some appearance of Contradiction to him, and quotes the Scriptures, which he saith are usually quoted, *viz.* Rom. 3. 28, *&c.*

Here 1 I demand of him who they are that quote, and against whom they quote those Scriptures? That they which quote them are the Protestant Churches and writers, and that they are the Papists against whom they are so usually quoted, he must needs confess, because he can produce none but Protestants that do, none but Papists against whom they do alledg these Scripures. For although the *Arminians* do enough declare themselves in their writings that they hold in common with the Papists, Justification by works, yet I could never find that they would suffer this Tenet to be brought to a dispute; but being charged therewith, they have with sacred protestations & adjurations denyed any such thought in their hearts, and so never permitted these or any other Scriptures to be quoted against them about this question, still declining the dispute. It must be therefore the Papists against whom *Mr. Br.* saith these Scriptures have been usually quoted. And this speaks out to us in many respects what the frame of this mans spirit is.

1 The integrity and ingenuity of his Conscience, that having but 2 pages backward, verbally renounced the Papists and all concurrence of his doctrine with theirs, he useth only a short digression to smooth the face, end spit in the mouth of *Socinus*; and then forthwith makes a bridg of St *Paul*, to return and make peace, and confirm a league with the Papists, as it were stroking the shavlings and telling them. *Notwithstanding all that I have said, I doubt not but ye well perceive therein the equivocations and mentall reservations which I have learned from you. Still my horses are your horses, my charrets your charrets,*

charrets, I am as yee are, and your Adversaries my Adversaries. Mark ye well how finely I shall here divert from you the Scripture darts which the Heretick's fling at you. This all may see to be the sum of his words, or at least implyed therein.

2 His consistency with himself, that what ere-while he denyed, here he affirms, *viz.* that he is not only Popish in this point, but also a patron of the Popish Cause: And thus also while he endeavors to purge his doctrine from all contradiction of Scripture, he becomes a Contradictor of himself.

3 His honesty in explaining his meaning at last, whom he pointed at throughout his Treatise under the name of ignorant *Antinomians, viz.* all that have quoted those Scriptures against justification by works.

4 His good will to the Protestant Religion, and to the doctrine of grace, that rather than these shall stand, he will say and unsay, joyn with, and borrow from Papists, Socinians, Arminians, (and why not the Turkish Alcaron also, or whatsoever prodigies of Doctors) that send men to blessednesse by the merit of their owne works.

5. His matchles worth arising out of all these, for which such a confluence of Divines from all parts of *England* is made to him, even such as were ere-while Zelots against Popery, Socinianism and Arminianism, untill they had fatted themselves with the spoyls of the friends thereof. Hath not the Lord cause to visit upon these men the breach of his Covenant, whereof they professe themselves at this day transcendently zealous? Is not this one principall branch thereof? Let others dream waking of the further exaltation of the present Ministry of this Land, I see no ground of expecting any Change but to the abasing thereof, though my self must take a share in such an abasement. With such plausibility every where is this man and every seducer received in their sowing the worst errors, if they will but pretend a zeal against supposed *Antinomians:* And so generally is the doctrine of grace slighted. I undertake to defend against all Opponents, that Mr. *Br* hath no one assertion in his whole Book about Justification by works, nor more than one, if one proof or argument to confirm such an assertion; nay scarce any word, phrase, or Apex, which hee hath not received from the Papists, Socinians, or at the best from the Arminians. I acknowledg in some places he runs more in the *Arminian*, than *Popish* method and dialect, when they speak more to the extolling

tolling of mans righteouſneſs, and annihilating of Gods grace: But in no one particle is he better then they. I appeal not only to the Learned, but alſo to the rationall among the Readers of his Book, when they looked upon its Title, *Aphoriſms of Juſtification*, whether they expected not that the truth of the Goſpel and doctrine of the Proteſtant Churches ſhould have been ſtoutly defended by ſo Scholaſtick a man, againſt *Papiſts*, *Arminians*, &c. But when contrariwiſe they find him undertaking no Combat againſt them, but all for them, and making none other his Averſaries but Proteſtants, ſometimes under, ſometimes without the nick-name of *Antinomians*: Is it not a ſtrange piece of incredulity, when hee ſo plainly diſcovereth himſelf, not to believe him, to whom he is a Friend, and to whom an Adverſary? And a groſs deluſion to lick up as honey from the dirt of Mr. *Brs.* ſhoos, what they deteſt as poyſon from the lips of *Bellarmin*, *Socinus*, and *Arminius?* But I incurr blame by digreſſing, therefore return to the matter.

2 I except againſt his quotations as done partially and unfaithfully, to beget in his weak and credulous Reader, an opinion that he and the Papiſts his Maſters have the whole body of the Scriptures on their ſide to prove Juſtification by works; But that the Proteſtants can only catch here and there a ſentence of Scripture that hath a ſeeming, and ſcarce a ſeeming to ſpeak for them. It is a Maxime of Mr. *Br.* himſelf, that men are ſeldom bold with Scripture to force it, but they are firſt bold with Conſcience to force it, *pag.* 297. Yet here he is bold not only to force, but to ſtifle Scriptures. When himſelf quoteth a Scripture to maintain his Popiſh Juſtification, ſee how he improves it in the ſame page: *If it were but ſome one phraſe diſſonant from the ordinary language of Scripture, I ſhould not doubt but it were to be reduced to the reſt. But when it is the very ſcope of a Chapter*, &c. *no whit diſſonant from any other Scripture; I think he that may ſo wreſt it as to make it unſay what it ſaith, may as well make him a Creed of his own, let the Scripture ſay what it will to the contrary.* Lo, what a mountain he can make of a mole-hill, and bring all Scriptures into the belly of one, making that one of what dimenſion he liſteth, & all the reſt to ſay what he commands them, when he is to plead for the Papiſts: But here when he is to produce what the Proteſtants have to urge againſt the Papiſts, what mincing and maiming doth he uſe? forcing the whole body of the Goſpel into a Cherriſtone; it is but here and there a ſound without ſubſtance that they beguile themſelves with. Did the man

(as

(as he pretends) seek to apprehend to himself, and sincerely to make out unto others Scripture Truth, we should find him faithfully alledging what the Churches of Christ have cited against Antichrist. His false dealing herein declares his hatred of the Truth, that he will not have the Scriptures shine upon it in their full splendor, that it may not be known and embraced. Nay we have the main body of the New Testament speaking for us, specially almost all the Doctrinal part of the Epistles to the *Romans*, *Galathians*, *Ephesians*, *Colossions*, *Hebrews*, all the four Evangelists, specially St *John*, as I have before shewed: A breviate of Scriptures wch our Divines have urged to this purpose I have before given, and it would be useless here to rehearse.

3. Even these few Scriptures which he quoteth, affirm that man is justified by Faith without the deeds of the Law, that if he were justified by Works, he had whereof to glory and boast himself; that if they which are of the Law be heirs, Faith is made void, and the promise of no effect. That it is of Faith that it may be of Grace; that it is by Grace through Faith, not of Works. Were there nothing else, is there not a strong appearance of Contradiction in these Scriptures to Mr. *Brs.* doctrine, that we are justified by Faith and Works together?

4 But see we how he evades these Scriptures and all other Testimonies of the Apostles, viz. *That his dispute is, what is the Righteousness which we must plead against the Accusation of the Law? or by which we are justified as the proper Righteousness of the Law? and this bee well concludeth is neither works nor faith, but the Righteousness which is by Faith, i. e. Christs Righteousness. But St.* James *his question is, what is the condition of our Justification by this Righteousness of Christ? whether Faith only? or Works also? so farr* Mr. Baxter.

Must not Mr. Br. needs be happy that hath learned so perfectly that which he cals else-where the Papists Feat of making the Scriptures a nose of wax, and turning them into his own complexion. Let any one now alledg against him that of the Apostle, *Gal.* 1. 8. *If Paul or an Angell from heaven shall preach to you any other Gospel than what you have received, let him be accursed.* Cannot he as prettily and solidly shift the Curse from him, and retort it upon the denouncer as he doth these Scriptures upon the alledgers. True may hee say, but I am not *Paul*, nor an Angell from heaven, therefore the Curse cannot fall on me. Nay, I have made *Paul* to preach another Gospel since his death, than what he preached in his life, Therefore

Paul

tolling of mans righteousnesse, and annihilating of Gods grace: But in no one particle is he better then they. I appeal not only to the Learned, but also to the rationall among the Readers of his Book, when they looked upon its Title, *Aphorisms of Justification*, whether they expected not that the truth of the Gospel and doctrine of the Protestant Churches should have been stoutly defended by so Scholastick a man, against *Papists*, *Arminians*, &c. But when contrariwise they find him undertaking no Combat against them, but all for them, and making none other his Aversaries but Protestants, sometimes under, sometimes without the nick-name of *Antinomians*: Is it not a strange piece of incredulity, when hee so plainly discovereth himself, not to believe him, to whom he is a Friend, and to whom an Adversary? And a gross delusion to lick up as honey from the dirt of Mr. *Brs.* shoos, what they detest as poyson from the lips of *Bellarmin*, *Socinus*, and *Arminius*? But I incurr blame by digressing, therefore return to the matter.

2 I except against his quotations as done partially and unfaithfully, to beget in his weak and credulous Reader, an opinion that he and the Papists his Masters have the whole body of the Scriptures on their side to prove Justification by works; But that the Protestants can only catch here and there a sentence of Scripture that hath a seeming, and scarce a seeming to speak for them. It is a Maxime of Mr. *Br.* himself, that men are seldom bold with Scripture to force it, but they are first bold with Conscience to force it, *pag.* 297. Yet here he is bold not only to force, but to file Scriptures. When himself quoteth a Scripture to maintain his Popish Justification, see how he improves it in the same page: *If it were but some one phrase dissonant from the ordinary language of Scripture, I should not doubt but it were to be reduced to the rest. But when it is the very scope of a Chapter*, &c. *no whit dissonant from any other Scripture; I think he that may so wrest it as to make it unsay what it saith, may as well make him a Creed of his own, let the Scripture say what it will to the contrary.* Lo, what a mountain he can make of a mole-hill, and bring all Scriptures into the belly of one, making that one of what dimension he listeth, & all the rest to say what he commands them, when he is to plead for the Papists: But here when he is to produce what the Protestants have to urge against the Papists, what mincing and maymming doth he use? forcing the whole body of the Gospel into a Cherristone; it is but here and there a sound without substance that they beguile themselves with. Did the man

(a

(as he pretends) seek to apprehend to himself, and sincerely to make out unto others Scripture Truth, we should find him faithfully alledging what the Churches of Christ have cited against Antichrist. His false dealing herein declares his hatred of the Truth, that he will not have the Scriptures shine upon it in their full splendor, that it may not be known and embraced. Nay we have the main body of the New Testament speaking for us, specially almost all the Doctrinal part of the Epistles to the *Romans*, *Galathians*, *Ephesians*, *Colossians*, *Hebrews*, all the four Evangelists, specially St. *John*, as I have before shewed: A breviate of Scriptures wch our Divines have urged to this purpose I have before given, and it would be useless here to rehearse.

3. Even these few Scriptures which he quoteth, affirm that man is justified by Faith without the deeds of the Law, that if he were justified by Works, he had whereof to glory and boast himself; that if they which are of the Law be heirs, Faith is made void, and the promise of no effect. That it is of Faith that it may be of Grace; that it is by Grace through Faith, not of Works. Were there nothing else, is there not a strong appearance of Contradiction in these Scriptures to Mr. *Brs.* doctrine, that we are justified by Faith and Works together?

4 But see we how he evades these Scriptures and all other Testimonies of the Apostles, viz. *That his dispute is, what is the Righteousness which we must plead against the Accusation of the Law? or by which we are justified as the proper Righteousness of the Law? and this bee well concludeth is neither works nor faith, but the Righteousness which is by Faith, i. e. Christs Righteousness. But St.* James *his question is, what is the condition of our Justification by this Righteousness of Christ? whether Faith only? or Works also? so farr* Mr. Baxter.

Must not Mr. Br. needs be happy that hath learned so perfectly that which he cals else-where the Papists Feat of making the Scriptures a nose of wax, and turning them into his own complexion. Let any one now alledg against him that of the Apostle, *Gal.* 1. 8. *If Paul or an Angell from heaven shall preach to you any other Gospel than what you have received, let him be accursed.* Cannot he as prettily and solidly shift the Curse from him, and retort it upon the denouncer as he doth these Scriptures upon the alledgers. True may hee say, but I am not *Paul*, nor an Angell from heaven, therefore the Curse cannot fall on me. Nay, I have made *Paul* to preach another Gospel since his death, than what he preached in his life, Therefore

Paul

Paul is accurſed. As good grounds hath he for this as his former arguing.

But let us ſee whether his Interpretation of theſe Scriptures be ſo ſolid as pretty. To that of *James* I have ſpoken before, therefore ſhall ſay little here. Onely I cannot omit how unſufferable his audacious confidence is, that he thinks it enough to ſay, without ſhewing, or endeavouring to ſhew it from the Context or otherwiſe, this is the meaning of *Pauls*, and that the ſcope of *James* his diſpute. No ſuch immodeſty is oft there to be found in the very *Jeſuits*, *Socinians*, and *Arminians*. They, when they go about to pervert in ſtead of expounding any Scripture, labour ſtoutly from the Context, and from a ſeeming Coherence of other Scriptures, to make ſuch a perverting expoſition either probable or plauſible: This man doth all *pro Imperio*, *Sic volo, ſic jubeo*, &c. I ſay it, what man or Angell dares to deny it? Doth hee think all the world to be his Dioceſs, that he may force (what he hath, or ſaith he hath upon his *Kederminſterians*) upon the conſciences of all men an implicit Faith, that all muſt believe when and becauſe he ſaith it? Is the infallible ſpirit gone out of *Zedechiah*, 1 *King.* 22. 24. or out of *Bellarmine* or *Arminius* into him? Or doth he execute the office of the Popes Legate, ſpeaking to us only that which is decreed in his unerring Chair? or hath hee gotten a monopoly of *Socinus* his Right Reaſon, which is infallible? what elſe can hee alledg that his word muſt be taken for a Law without diſpute? Or is it indeed becauſe he finds Gods word will yeeld him no ſuccour, therefore he muſt *proprio Marte militare*, act in his own name, becauſe God is not with him? So indeed it ſeemeth, for neither God, nor reaſon, nor any thing els, but a high conceit of himſelf will be acceſſary to his reaſonleſs Concluſions, *viz.* that *James* his queſtion is, what is the condition of our Juſtification by Chriſts Righteouſneſs; when *James* in his whole diſpute there, neither expreſly nor implyedly utters a word of Chriſts righteouſneſs, or if Mr. Bs *Jeſuito-Arminian* condition, nor any thing that can eaſily be reduced to Chriſt himſelf. Or where doth *Paul* diſpute only of the righteouſnes proper to juſtification, and not alſo of the way and means by which this righteouſneſs may be applyed to us and made ours? Or in which of his quoted Scriptures, or any other of the Apoſtles writings; when he excludes works, doth he exclude Faith alſo from its ſubſerviency to juſtifying? Such peremptory dreams of a haughty brain cannot be more fitly anſwered than with con-

tempt

tempt and silence. Thus should I do, were it not in respect to some pious and not unlearned men, that have taken some infection of the Epidemicall disease of our times, too easily to drink down errors, differing herein only from the vulgar, that error is more appetible to them from a learned and sophisticall, than truth from a plainer, though faithfull hand. Let a man once have the name of a learnnd Scholar, and strict-walking *Pharisee*, all his Doctrines by such men are concluded to be of rare use and excellency, before they be seen whether they be white or black, from Heaven or from Hell,. Not a few of these men having in my hearing stood firm and unmoved in the defence of the doctrines of this book of Mr. *Brs.* not being able to speak any thing to refell the objections made against it, but this, that the Author thereof is an eminently learned and pious man. As if Satan had not the wit to make choyse of his instruments that have the most compleat aptitude and power to deceive, or that the Jews had not so much to say for their *Pharisees*, the Papists for their *Bellarmine*, and the Remonstrants for their *Arminius*, or the Devill had forgotten his ancient subtlety when he will seduce from the verity of Christs Gospel, to change himself into an Angell of Light, or that no damning errour could proceed from a self-saving, or rather self-deceiving Pharisee. To cleer up the truth to such, at left to give their occasion to search the Scripures by which they may cleer it to themselves, I shall lay and compare together *Paul* and Mr. Br. in that which Mr. Br. saith was the question about which *Paul* disputed, that it may be made evident whether they agree, or contradict either the other.

To this purpose by the way, there is to be taken out of the way a fallacy that lurketh in Mr. *Brs.* words, where he saith, *The dispute of St.* Paul *is upon this Question*; It is not enough to say this was *a Question*, except he say also it was *the Question*, yea *the Onely Question* upon which the Apostle disputed in those places where he excludeth works, and inforceth Faith alone to be ordeined as effectuall to justification. He disputed in some of his Epistles upon many questions. To reduce what hee disputed severally to the severall questions, all to one, were to make non-sense of the whole. The same may be said of all men, yea of the most Scholastick disputes of Mr. *Br.* himself, who is a greater Philosopher, and more studied in Logick and Metaphysicks than ever the Apostle was. But I deny it to be the onely or the chief question about which St. *Paul* so disputeth, what is the Righteousnesse which wee must plead a-

gainſt the Accuſation of the Law? or by which wee are juſtified as the proper Righteouſneſſ of the Law? I grant it to be one, but a leſs principall queſtion upon which he diſputes. But the more principall queſtion is, in generall, by what means we may be intereſſed into Chriſt, or obtain the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to become ours, and ſo ſtill retein it to juſtification? More particularly whether the Native Fæderall holineſſ of the Jewes, and the priviledges of the Covenant in part mentioned, *Rom.* 9. 4, 5. & *Phil.* 3. 5. & *Gal.* 2. 15. Or their actuall and perſonall righteouſneſſe and ſincere obedience to the Law mentioned, *Phil.* 3. 6. *Mat.* 20. 12. and the 19, 20. together with all the Typicall purgings mentioned in the 9. & 10. Chapters of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*? On the other ſide, whether all the Naturall and Morall righteouſneſs of the Gentiles, which they performed by the inſtinct of the Law of Nature written in their Conſciences, without the help or knowledg of Gods written law, or their exemption from the Covenant of God made with the Jews, (For ſome of the believing Gentiles, reading the promiſes made of calling unto the grace of Chriſt them that were not Gods people, or beloved before, weakly concluded that their former uncircumciſion and uncovenant-ſhip was a ſpeciall furtherance to their admiſſion unto Chriſt, as may be probably gathered from *Rom.* 11. 19. & *Gal.* 5. 6.) whether any of theſe kinds of holineſſe and works of righteouſneſs, either with Faith, or without Faith? or whether Faith alone without all, or any of theſe, be required as inſtrumentall, ſubſervient, and effectuall to inright us to the Juſtification which is by Chriſt? This was the more principall queſtion upon which *Paul* diſputeth in the places before mentioned; Somewhat he ſaith to the former, but leſſe principally, and ſeldom but in ſubſerviency to this. So the queſtion upon which *Paul* diſputes in his Epiſtles, and Mr *Br.* in his Aphoriſms, is one and the ſame, but their Concluſions abſolutely contradictory either to other. The one concludeth that Faith alone without mans works and righteouſneſs; The other, that not faith alone, but Faith as a work together with all other works of righteouſneſſe do juſtifie, and all morall duties collaterally with Faith are required to make the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt ours to juſtification. No greater or more palpable Contradiction can be deviſed. *Whoſoever ſhall preach another Goſpell* [of Juſtification otherwiſe than by Faith in Chriſt without works] *let him be accurſed*, ſaith *Paul*: Whoſoever ſhall be practically a ſolifidian, truſt to a bare

bare Faith, and not work for Justification *shall be Damned* saith Mr. Br. If one of these be granted to be an Apostle of Christ, the other must needs be proclaimed to be the Apostle of Antichrist. But whether this which I have expressed be indeed the principal question on which the Apostle so disputeth, *adhuc sub judice lis est.* We are left uncertain on both hands may some say. True, and if I onely say and not shew it, I shall be guilty of the fault which I blame in Mr. Br. And so we may deserve both to be laught at as Triflers. This therefore is the next thing to be added.

First then if we do but consider to whom, and against whom the Apostle handleth these disputes, (for Mr. Br. reduceth them all to his Epistles) it will be more than probable to every rationall man, that his most principall question is, By what means we possesse and continue in the possession of the righteousnesse which is by Christ, to Justification? And but secondarily, less principally, and in subserviency to this question, What the righteousnesse is by which we are to be justified. The persons to whom he writeth were all Christians, the purest and most eminent Churches of Christ, that had received the pure doctrine of Christ by the preaching of the Apostles, *viz.* that (whereas sinn and death and the Curse by sinn reigned over all men in all the world, so that all were Children of wrath, and every soul guilty before God) Christ was given of the Father to be the Author of Righteousnes and life, by the Mediation of his death; that in him and in no other name under heaven was salvation attainable, that whosoever would beleeve in him should have everlasting life; should be Justified freely by Grace through the Redemption which is in Jesus Christ; and by their very receiving of him should obtein power to become the sonns of God; notwithstanding all their former pollutions, & without all prejacent qualifications in them to purchase so great a Redemption. Such was the doctrine preached to them, and in the embracing and professing of this Doctrine, and their Faith in Christ the alone redeemer they were first admitted into Christ, gathered into Churches and so continued a while stablished in this truth with the joy of the Holy Ghost abounding in them. The persons against whom he disputeth were chiefly if not onely the False Apostles of the Circumcision, who also professed the Faith of Christ and preached it, not the unbeleeving *Jewes*, for these should not have had any such audience from the Churches; But such as *went out from the Apostles and the Church that was at Hierusalem to preach Christ*, Act. 15. 24. *Such as came*

from James, Gal. 2. 12. *Such as boasted themselves to be of Christ*, to hold forth the doctrine of *Peter*, 1 Cor. 1. 12. *Such as preached Christ of envie, strife, and contention, not sincerely*, but under the lure of so holy a name to take the advantage to deceive, *Phil.* 1. 15, 16. Who not labouring to gather Disciples to Christ out of infidelity as the Apostles had done, entred into the several Churches before stablished by the Apostles, *troubling them with words, subverting their souls, teaching them that they must be circumcised and keep the Law of Moses, els they could not be saved*, Act. 15. 1. 24. And there were of the *Sect of the Pharisees which beleeved*, Act. 15. 5. Emissaries out of those *Many thousands or rather Myriads of the Jewes at Hierusalem which beleeved yet were all zealous of the Law*, Act. 21. 20. Had the Apostles dispute been against such as had apostatized from the profession of Christ, and against such unbeleevers as had seduced them from trusting on Christs imputed, to rest upon their own inherent righteousnes, for justification; it had not been besides the purpose to have it his question (as Mr. *Bt* saith) whether it be Christs righteousnes or our own righteousnes that we must plead against the accusations of the Law? But seeing both the seduced and seducers with whom he dealeth were such as professed faith in Christ, as their justifier and Saviour, and questioned onely whether Faith alone, or els their righteousnes & works also together with Faith, were required to inright them to Christs righteousnes and salvation, it had been impertinent if not ridiculous to have made it his question what the proper righteousnes is by which we are justified; For this had been to decline and not to prosecute the question between him and them. They would have granted him all that he concluded without the least dammage to their Cause. Therefore his question was principally, By what means we come to partake of the righteousnes of Christ to Justification?

2 Let the Apostle himself give his Testimony what his principall question was, For he better knew his own minde than Mr. *Bt* or my self. And first in his Epistle to the *Romans* having for an introduction to the question, in the three first Chapters proved both the *Jewes* with all their legall and the Gentiles with all their naturall righteousnes and unrighteousnes to be under sin, guilt, and condemnation, he no sooner in the third Chapter begins to speak of the mean of their recovery Christ Jesus, but he annexeth also by what means we come to have right in him. In both which he no less Contradicteth Mr. *Bt* than if he had seen before what Mr. *Bt* hath

hath written so many ages after. Of the former he affirmeth *that we are justified (as by Christ, so) by the Redemption which is in Jesus Christ, whe was set forth to be a propitiation* [or expiatory sacrifice] *for our sins*, Rom. 3. 24, 25. Not as Mr. *Br* before so stoutly Contended, as he is our Lord, *i. e.* in his sense our Law-giver. Of the latter, that it is *faith alone that makes this redemption and Propitiation ours to Justification*, namely, *Faith in his bloud, Faith without the deeds of the Law, Faith which excludeth, without works which include boasting*, ver. 25, 27, 28. And this faith in the death of Christ, without works, without deeds, cannot include in it, Morall works and righteousness unto Justification, as Mr. *Br* would extort from it elsewhere, by making Christ as our Lord and Lawgiver the object of Justifying Faith. At length he Concludeth *ver.* 30. that both in them which have some seeming and plausible qualification of righteousness and works, and in them that have it not, it is not that righteousness of their own, but Faith which Justifieth. And that this Faith is no less effectuall to the justifying of them that unto that very day, have been ungodly, than of them which from their very birth have seemed to be holy to the Lord. So much is Comprehended in those words of the Apostle ; *It is one God which Justifieth the Circumcision by faith, and the un-circumcision through Faith.* In these words is included the whole State of *Pauls* question. The Apostle writing to the Church that was at *Rome*, Consisting of beleeving Jewes and Gentiles, endeavours to heal the divisions, Close the breaches, and settle a sweet union and Communion between them. This he applyeth himself unto, first in that great and fundamentall point of Christianitie, viz. Justification by Christ, in which they dissented : Both Jewes and Gentiles acknowledged Justification and salvation to be by Christ alone, but in this they differed. The Jewes Confined this salvation by Christ to themselves alone, that to them onely he was promised, that they alone were qualified and in a capacity to receive him and the benefits that are by him. That he came to be the Saviour of his own hallowed people that had waited for him, not of the common and uncleane Pagans that were *aliens from the Common wealth of Israel, and strangers from the Covenant of promise.* To this purpose they boasted of their Naturall, Federal, and personall righteousness and holines, qualifying them for the Justification which is by Christ, of all which the Gentiles were destitute. Their naturall Righteousness and holiness, *that they were Jewes by nature and not sinners of the Gentiles, the seed of Abraham the holy stock to whom and whose seed the*

promise

promise was made: Their Fœderall holines, *That they alone of all nations were in Covenant with God, and did bear the badge and seal of the Covenant, Circumcision in their Flesh, by which they were distinguished from all other people,* as holy to God, when all other Nations under the Sunne were an abhomination in his sight: Their Legall holines that they had the Law, Word, and Oracles of God Committed to them, all other Nations being left without Law, without God, and without hope, in the world. Their personall and Actuall righteousnes, that in reference to this holy Law of God they had walked exactly, kept it from their youth, and touching the righteousnes thereof were blameles; When contrarwise the Gentiles had walked inordinately, lawlesly after the instinct of their own nature, and lusts of their own hearts, servants to idols and devills, not to God. For this Cause they Contended that they by this their righteousnes had, that the Gentiles by means of their unrighteousnes had not right to the redemption and Justification which are by Christ. That the Gentiles in stead of the naturall holines before mentioned must become Proselytes, and so the ascititious or adopted Children of *Abraham*, becoming *Jewes*, must receive the seale of the Covenant Circumcision in their flesh; receive and be brought under the Law; and become personally righteous in keeping it; *Else they could not be saved by Christ*, Act. 15. 1, 24. Their bare Faith in Christ without their own righteousnes and works could not make them partakers of the righteousnesse and salvation which are by Christ. And who seeth not here that Mr. *Brs* doctrine is one and the same in generall with theirs that were the first heretical troublers and subverters of the Church of Christ? But against this plea of the beleeving *Jewes*, the Apostle layeth his Contradictory Conclusion, That both the Circumcision and the uncircumcision, they that had and they that had not all or any of these kinds of righteousnes were made partakers of Justification through Christ, onely by Faith in him. That our own prejacent works and righteousnes are nothing to further, nor our former unrighteousnes and sinn any thing to hinder our Justification, but Faith in Christ is all: *He that beleeveth is not condemned, he that beleeveth not is already condemned*, whether he be Jew or Gentile, clean or unclean outwardly; because as he had said before ver. 22, 23. *There is no difference, For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.* This Conclusion that Faith alone without our prejacent or concomitant works and righteousnes do make the righteous-

nes

ness which is by Christ ours to Justification, he proveth soundly in the 4th Chapter. 1 From the example of *Abraham* the Father of the Faithfull. By what means *Abraham* found and obteined the Justification which is by Christ, by the same means all now obteine it that are Justified. But *Abraham* found or obteined it not by his own righteousness or works, but by Faith. Therefore so do now all that are justified. The proposition he leaves as standing so firm on its own pillars that none will dare to seek the demolishing thereof. The assumption he proves in both its members, that it was not by his own righteousnes: either Natural, *i. e.* derived from parents and ancestors, *for they were Idolaters and served other Gods, Josh.* 24. 2. Or federall in the *Jewes* sense, *for he was justified before he was circumcised, and after received Circumcision as a seal of the Righteousness of Faith*, ver. 10, 11, of this 4th Chapter to the *Romans*: or Legal, For *he was so Justified* 400 *years before the Law was given*: Or personall by the works of righteousness which he had done: For then first he should *have had matter of boasting* that he had done something towards his own Justification, *ver.* 2. And secondly, then *his justification should have been reckoned not of Grace but of debt*, and so the glory thereof should have redounded to *Abraham* and not to God, *ver.* 4. And if by no one of these kinds of his own, then not at all by his own righteousness. That it was by Faith he proves by clear Testimony of Scripture, *ver.* 3. Therefore the conclusion stands that we are justified also by faith without works. That Faith and not any righteousness of our own makes Christs righteousness ours.

Another Argument he draws from clear and evident Scripture, witnessing *that the righteousness and justification, which consisteth in the forgiveness, not imputing and covering of sinn, is made ours without works*, [therefore by Faith alone] *ver.* 6, 7, 8.

When in these two Arguments none can deny but that the righteousness and Justification which *Abraham* obteined, and which Consisted not in the doing, but in the imputing of righteousness, and in the pardoning and not imputing of sinn; is the Justification which is by Christ; and when the Apostle laboureth not at all to prove this to be *The proper Righteousness to Justification*, but takes it as granted and unquestioned: all must acknowledge that his question was not, What righteousness it is that Justifieth? whether Christs? or ours? But when all his dispute is confined to this one point, to prove that this righteousness by Christ is made ours not

at all by works, but altogether by Faith, what rational man can be so swayed by a *Spirit of Contradiction*, as to say with Mr. *Br.* that St *Pauls* question was not to make out, by what means this Justification by Christ may be made ours? Whosoever will see these two Arguments further and fully illustrated and amplified, together with more arguments to these annexed, let him peruse the residue of this 4 Chap. And if he return with his Reason sound, and brings not this verdit, that is is impudence not judgement in Mr. *Br.* to state *Pauls* question as he doth: Then am I a stranger both to *Paul* and Reason.

Again, when the Apostle still insisting upon the same subject, setts forth the priviledges of them that are justified by Faith, doth withall affirm *that while they were yet sinners, Christ dyed for them, and so they became Justified by his bloud; and being yet enemies are reconciled to God by his death*, Rom. 5. 1, 8, 9, 10. thereby implying that there is nothing of our own works and righteousness, (except sin and enmity against God be such) that doth or can Concurr to our justification; so leaving justification to Faith onely: it is evident that his principall question was not whether we are Justified by Christ, but whether Faith alone or works with Faith are appointed of God in order to Justification?

I shall forbear to cite short testimonies from other Epistles of the Apostle, evincing this Truth: and pass to his Epistle to the *Galathians* in which he wholly levelleth to this mark. It cannot be denyed by Mr. *Br.* himselfe that the Apostle there disputeth not of a legal but Gospel Justification, and that this is a Justification onely by Christ: that when he saith, *If any man, if we, or an Angel from heaven preach any other Gospel*, &c. his meaning is, not a Justification out of Christ (for this should be a legal not a Gospel Justification) but any other way to the Justification which is by Christ, *save that which we have preached, let him be accursed*, Gal. 1. 8, 9. Herein it was agreed between the Apostle and the false Apostles, that Christ is the alone Justifier, and that salvation is onely by him, and to this all the seduced ones among the *Galathians* assented. Else had they been Apostate from Christ to the Law, and not *to another Gospel*, as the Apostle terms it, *Gal.* 1. 6. And from their *beginning in the Spirit to seek perfecting by the flesh*. The question therefore was, whether Faith alone in Christ, or else together with it, a naturall, federall and practicall righteousness after the rule of the Law, were required to the acquiring of the Justification which is by Christ.

Hence

Hence is that his zealous expostulating with *Peter* and *Barnabas* for giving some occasion to the Gentiles to question whether besides Faith in Christ, some Conformity to the Law were not also needfull to Justification. *We* (saith he) *who are Iewes by Nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the Law, but by the Faith of Iesus Christ, even we have beleeved in Iesus Christ, that we might be justified by the Faith of Christ, and not by the works of the Law: for by the works of the Law shall no flesh be justified*, Gal. 2. 15, 16. The sum of his debate is as if he had said: If we that besides the supereminent prerogative vouchsafed to us to be the Apostles of the Lord Jesus, have a derivative holines by nature and the Covenant of God, from *Abraham*, and withall a righteousnes of works by living up to our utmost in the highest pitch of obedience to the Law; having found by revelation from the Lord Iesus Christ, that all these are nothing available, but Faith alone proper and effectuall to obtein the salvation and righteousnes which is by Christ; have wholly rejected all confidence in and use of these in order and reference to justification, and made our addresses by Faith alone to partake of his righteousnes: why do we by our judaizing beguile the poor Gentiles that have none of these prerogatives, into a pernicious opinion of perfitting their justification by Christ, with their practicall righteousnes in obedience to the Law? Where it is to be noted that in one and the same verse the Apostle doth thrice expressly banish works from having any thing to doe in the business of justification by Christ, and no less often attribute it to Faith and beleeving in Christ without all help of works. And can it be doubted what the question is about which he disputeth?

To the same scope is directed all that he delivereth in the third Chapter. That he pronounceth the *Galathians, foolish and even bewitched that having obteined justification already by Faith alone in Christ, they would be seduced to seek the perfecting thereof by works*, Gal. 3. 1, 2, 3. *That while they were ambitious to become the Children of Abraham, they fell utterly from Abraham and from the justification which Abraham found, by seeking it another way then Abraham found it*, viz. *by works and not by Faith onely*, ver. 6, 7, 8, 9. That so to seek it, *was the way to meet with the Curse in steed of the blessing of Christs righteousnesse*, ver. 10—12. of which more may be said a little after. That the justification which is by Christ, discendeth by promise to us, and promises are the object of Faith not of works, *ver.* 17, 18, 22.

But all this together with what the Apoſtle diſputeth of liberty and bondage in the fourth Chapter, I leave to them that will but conſiderately read it, to judge whether it evinceth not that to be *Pauls* queſtion which I have mentioned.

Laſtly, when the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 5. 4. brandiſheth ſo heavy a denuntiation againſt ſuch as had ſuffered themſelves in this point to be ſeduced by the falſe Apoſtles whom Mr *Bax.* followeth as his guides and gods. *Chriſt is become of no effect to you, whoſoever of you are juſtified by the Law ye are fallen from Grace.* What force had there been in this wrathfull threat, if the queſtion between him and them had been about the proper Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified? if they had held it to be their own righteouſneſs in oppoſition to *Paul* that held it to be the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, they would have laughed at ſuch a Commination as a meerly frighting ſquibb or ſcar-crow anſwering, we grant all, that we are fallen from Grace, that Chriſt is become of no effect to us: But what damage can by all this befall us? we make not Chriſt our Juſtifier, but labour to Juſtifie our ſelves, we ſeek Salvation not from Grace, but as a debt in juſtice due to the Righteouſneſs of our own works. The Apoſtle ſurely was not ſuch an ignorant Antinomian, as to diſpute ſo impotently that his Arguments might by ſubtle *Baxterians* be thus flung back as abſurdities in his face: It is therefore evident that the *Galathians* when moſt ſeduced, ceaſed not to make Chriſt their Righteouſneſs, but had yeelded to this impoſture (as the next Verſe declareth) that not Faith alone but their own works and righteouſnes with it, were pre-required to make them capable of the righteouſneſs which is by Chriſt, and that upon this ground the Apoſtle denounceth them to be Apoſtates from Chriſt and Grace, becauſe they ſought by their own righteouſneſs to entitle themſelves to the righteouſneſſe which is by Chriſt, and ſought it not by Faith alone. If any demand the reaſon of this Conſequence, that whoſoever ſeeketh right to the Juſtification of Chriſt by his own works, makes himſelf an alien from Chriſt, from Grace; the Apoſtle in part implyeth it in that which he ſpeaketh in theſe 4 and 5 verſes of Chapter 5. But had more fully explained himſelf, Chap. 3. 9, 10, 11, 12. So that by comparing together what he hath ſaid in both places, the reaſon of his Concluſion reſulteth into all mens view: viz. that ſuch a one ſeeketh the righteouſneſs and ſalvation which are by Chriſt, in a legall not an evangelicall way, by works and not by faith, there-

therefore is bound to bring the perfect righteousness and works which the Law requireth to make him capable of justification by Christ, or els falls from Cnrist, from Grace, to his everlasting ruine.

I shall add no more upon this subject, not because the Scripture hath no more, but because I hold this sufficient, and know the morosity and humorousness of most readers in our times, preferring an erroneous conciseness, before a sound and full manifestation of the truth. But my endeavour is to please not men but Christ. I leave Mr. *Br* to trample his own rule, not to be bold with Scripture by being first bold with Conscience. I dare not usurp to my self his peremptory audaciousness with one breath of the mouth to destroy the whole Gospel, in saying onely not shewing and proving that it must be thus understood. He that can so do with holy things, bewrayeth much pride and prophanness in his heart, though he be never so much pharisaically enamelled and phylacterized in the outside. Let him see how he can answer God for his audacious curtness, I shall not fear the censures of men for my length in bringing to light what he hath stifled in darkness. Let my style please or displease fancies, it shall suffice me to have taken off his first Paradoxicall imposture that he brings to prove his doctrine to be the same with *Pauls*. This is not all that he hath to say, his other Reasons or rather Sophisms follow in the next Chapter.

Chap. XXI.

Mr. Baxters *other Reasons to evince the same thing, Examined.*

Bax. 2 p. 308. *Paul doth either in expresse words, or in the sense and scope of his speech, exclude onely the works of the Law, that is the fulfilling of the conditions of the Law our selves. But never the fulfilling of the Gospel conditions that we may have part in Christ. Indeed, if a man should obey the Commands of the Gospel with a legall intent, that it might be a righteousness conform to the Law of works; this obedience is not Evangelicall but legall obedience: for the Form giveth the Name.*

No leſs oracularly than the Devil of old was wont to ſpeak out of *Delphos*. For this alſo as the former is onely ſaid not ſhewed and proved. What doth he mean by ſuch imperious Concluſions, but out of the abounding of his humility and ſelf-abaſement to proclaim to the world that he is a God, and that the words of his lips muſt be made the judge of all Scriptures, and the Canon of all mens Faith? When he hath ſpoken we muſt ſubject both judgments and Conſcience, without ſearching further. It is a truth, he that cannot err hath ſaid it. Were it a Concluſion univerſally received in the Churches of Chriſt, which he here delivereth, it had been indeed ſuperfluous to waſt time and labour in proving what all grant. But when it is but a dream of his own brain ſneezed thence through his Noſtrils, or ſome ſpirit by his Chimiſtry extracted out of *Bellarmine*, *Socinus*, and *Arminius* their notionall Fancies; when all the pious and judicious of all the Proteſtant Churches have been unacquainted with it, & lay down Concluſions contradictory to it, what els but a moſt arrogant ſelf Confidence, and contempt of his betters, could move him thus to ſpit Paradoxes, without the leaſt endeavours to give a demonſtration of the leaſt probability of them. Doth he think his raptures ſo Divine, that the holieſt and moſt judicious of all mortals muſt lick his ſpittle as Angels food, without enquiring what ſubſtance and vertue there is in it? But this is the ſpirit and genius of the Jeſuits, whom he followeth as his guides if not Gods, and againſt whom in this very caſe our Claſſicall Divines have ſo much and juſtly complained in theſe latter years. *Satis eſt hodie Jeſuitis noſtris* (ſaith Dr. *Twiſſe*) *pro authoritate neſcio qua, quidlibet affirmare, & dictata ſua nulla probatione fulta, nobis obtrudere.* i. e. The Jeſuits of our time think it ſufficient by their own I know not what Authority, to affirm any thing, and obtrude upon us their own dictates without any proof to ſupport them. And *Chamier* often, calling it their *Tyranny*, [*Sic volo, ſic jubeo*, &c.] *Qui cum alienam ſententiam adeo refellant frigide ſuam tamen obtrudant nulla confirmatam Argumento*, i. e. which when they ſo coldly refell the opinion of others', yet obtrude their own without any Argument to confirme it. Againe, *Quis non miretur abijs viris nullo ſigno indicatam vim conſequentiæ, ſed relictam nobis divinandam? At hæc non jam ſegnities eſt ſed dolus malus. Certe hoc eorum eſt ingenium, qui maxime ſunt inter ſophiſtas, nempe, ut eas occultent partes quas vident, infirmiſſimas.* i. e. Who would not marvell, that theſe men ſhould conclude,

Vind. lib. 1. par. 2. degr. 3. ſect. 1. prope finem.

Panſtr. tom. 1. lib. 1. c. 19. n. 11.

Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 6. n. 8.

clude, without shewing by any sign the force of the Consequence. But leaving us to Divine or conjecture it? This is not sloth but evill deceit. This indeed is the quality of these men that are greatest among the Sophisters, to hide those parts which they see most weak. As to Mr. *Brs* distinction here (which is of the same kind with the most of those that he hath in this Tractate) between the works of the Law as they are they fulfilling of the Conditions of the Law our selves, or as they are the fulfilling of the Conditions of the Gospel: enough were said, if I should onely say what *Chamier* saith to the like wild distinctions of the Jesuits, *Si e Scriptura, cedo locum, & cedimus: Sin e Scholasticorum somniis, ois xapaus*, i. e. If these distinctions be taken out of the Scripture, name where and we submit; but if out of the dreams of the School-men, we leave them to the Crowes. *Id. To. 2. l. 8. cap. 6. n. 17.*

But observable it is that when the most conspicuous men in Learning and all outward accomplishments, do once fall from the truth and simplicity of the Gospel, they forthwith yeeld up themselves, not caring what stone they throw, if with it they may wound the Grace of God and face of the Lord Christ. Thus do we find Mr. *Br.* here contradicting himself, to choak the truth. In his former Sophisticall eluding of the authority of *Pauls* testimony against him, we found him affirming, that where *Paul* and *James* treat of Justification, *it was James his Question and not Pauls, what is the Condition of our Justification by the Righteousnesse of Christ? whether Faith onely? or works also? But Pauls Question to be, what the Righteousnesse is which we must plead against the accusations of the Law? by which we are justified as the proper Righteousnesse of that Law?* viz. *whether our own or Christs righteousnesse?* Here now in the very next breath without any one word interserted, he affirms *Pauls* Question to be what he there denyed, what the condition is of our Justification by Christ or having part in Christ? What he excludeth and what he includeth to this purpose. This is the integrity of the man, first wilfully to lay down his Conclusion, that he will pervert the Gospel of Christ, and then to say and gain-say any thing, all things, that Malice it self against the Gospel can prompt or dictate to him.

And what is it that he produceth here in the second place to elude and lay prostrate *Pauls* authority? The notion and sound of the great God *Condition*, a god which neither Christ nor any of his Prophets or Apostles ever knew, much less ever named as operative

in

in the busines of Justification. Yet such a *Dagon* to Mr. Bx. that if he fall shivered, all *Mr. Bxs.* Divinity together with himself must fall after into the dirt. As to the matter it self, whether there be any Conditions of the Gospel? and what Condition? and how far it may be granted? all these have been so fully examined before, that unless I delighted to feed upon *crambe* a hundred times more then *bis cocta*, I must here to prevent the inconvenience of nauseousnes to my self and the Reader, in stead of Answer transmit the Reader to what hath been Answered oft before.

As for that which he philosophizingly distinguisheth between the works and conditions of the Law, and the works and conditions of the Gospel: 1 He onely saith all but proveth nothing; therefore deserves onely the contempt of, not an Answer from his Reader. 2 He saith nothing but what he hath been taught by the Papists, that *though we cannot be justified by the works of the Law, yet we are justified by Gospel works such as Faith is.* And must the Conclusions of the holy Apostaticall not Apostolicall Church be Canonicall to us, because he hath made them so to himself? 3 If he therefore forbears to prove what he saith because he holds it enough proved by the Papists already, and so transmits his Reader to their Writings: We also refer the reader to the perusall of the works of our Protestant writers that have dashed into shivers all such seeming proofs of the papists, and brought to light the truth which they sought to imprison in darkness. 4 Whatsoever he fableth here of Gospel works, yet are they all legall or works of the Law which he obtrudeth upon men to Justification, or (as he here phraseth it) to acquire part in Christ, even to Faith it self he attributes no such property or power, but as it is a morall work which the Law commandeth, as we have found him speaking. 5 (to come to that in which the whole force of his reasoning here lyeth) It is false what he affirmeth, either *that Paul doth in expres words, or in the sense and scope of his speech, exclude only the works of the Law, but never the fulfilling of the same works, as required by the Gospel* (for unless he so meaneth he saith nothing) *from their co-operation with Faith to Justification:* or that *this is the real difference between Legall and Gospel works*, that whereas in matter and substance they are one, yet as they are done to justifie us by their own righteousnes, they are works of the Law, but as done to justifie us by the righteousnes of Christ, so they are works of the Gospel, or Gospel Conditions. This is nothing but the Sophistry

phistry of a brain sophisticated with strong delusions to falsifie and nullifie the pure word of God. For,

1 What doth he bring to prove any least particle of what he saith? if he had the testimony of God and Christ on his side, would he leave their name and authority unmentioned.

2 The Apostle when he treats of Justification by Christ, doth not onely exclude works of the Law, but works indefinitely and universally, any works, all works from having any power ordinate or not ordinate, to give us part in it or him, as hath been fully in its place before demonstrated.

3 His dispute every where is (as was declared and confirmed in the former Chapter) not so much what is the righteousnesse which by its own power and vertue justifieth, but what it is that instrumentally uniteth us to Christ for justification by him: This he denyeth to all to any works, and attributes to Faith alone, as hath been there evidenced.

4 In such places where he expresly speaketh of the works of the Law he means the Law written, as it was given and pertained to the Jewes alone, as a signall evidence of Gods love to them above all other Nations. This is clear from the Apostles own Testimony, Ro. 2. 12, 14. 17. & 5. 13. as also where he numbreth Circumcision, the observation of times and meats, and other rituall peeces of the Ceremoniall Law, together with the morall works of the Decalogue. And will Mr. *Br* say that these rituall works are Conditions also of our part in Christ?

5 When he so giveth the Adject of the Law to works, calling them the works of the Law, he doth it to beat down the pride and boasting of the Jewes that gloried in the Law, *Rom.* 2. 23. declaring to them that although the Law were one principall prerogative vouchsafed to them not to any other people, *Rom.* 9. 4. yet the works of the Law so glorious and privilegious had nothing to do with Faith to further our Justification by Christ: but that the Gentiles without the Law had as free accesse to God by Faith in Christ, as they with all the furniture of the Law and its works.

6 *Paul* doth exclude all works under what name or notion soever, from justifying so as Faith justifieth, or to be instrumentall and conditionall to justification as Faith is. But Faith is instrumentall or (as M. *Br.* terms it) conditionall to receive Christ to justification. Therefore works are excludeded from being so conditionall, or to be Conditions of the Gospel, as he phraseth it.

This

This is apparent by thoſe Scriptures where *Paul* ſaith, *Not of works but of Faith, by Faith without works, to him that worketh not, but beleeveth*, &c. as hath been oft before alledged and amplified. And all this of works without the adjection of the Law, yea of works done hundreds of years before the Law (to which *Paul* had reference in ſuch diſputes) was given.

7 *Paul* denyeth to works any operation in the Juſtification of *Abraham*, or of us that obtein the ſame Juſtification with *Abraham*. But the works which are denyed to juſtifie *Abraham*, could not in *Pauls* ſenſe be the works of the Law, being acted 430 years before the Law was given; and the Juſtification which is common to *Abraham* and his ſpirituall ſeed, was and is juſtification by Chriſt. So that works have nothing to do with Faith to condition us for juſtification by Chriſt. This hath been made out in the former Chapter, from *Rom.* 4. 1, &c.

8 And laſtly, If ſuch imperious, arbitrary, unreaſonable, and unproved diſtinctions be harkened to in Divinity, what one part either of Law or Goſpel ſhall abide ſacred? The whole word, as Mr. Br. the great Artificer in the Trade, ſomewhere complaines, ſhall be made a waxen Noſe. For with as much integrity as Mr. *B.* hath here uſed to put the greateſt Article of the Goſpel to a topſie turnie, may I mock at all the Commandments of the Decalogue, with a diſtinctionary vanity to nullifie them. *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me.* True, may I ſay, but God meaneth other Gods of the Pagans deviſing, not excluding the Gods of my own feigning. *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image.* That is right (ſaid the Greeks once) but God here excludeth the graven Images which the *Romanes*, not the painted Images which we adore. *Thou ſhalt not ſteale*, the thief may here diſtinguiſh, the lean Cattell are here excluded not the fat. *Thou ſhalt not murther*; the Phariſees gloſſe upon it was, to wit, my friends, but my enemies I may. The like might I ſay of the reſt, yea of every Goſpel truth alſo, and all with as good reaſon as Mr. *Br.* here deals with *Paul*. *We are juſtified*, or have part in Chriſt, *not by works but by Faith, by Faith without works*, ſaith *Paul*: Right ſaith Mr. *Br.* for he excludeth works onely as they are works of the Law, not as they are works and Conditions of the Goſpel. Yet, *Ultra Sauromatas fugere hinc libet*, it makes me not onely to wiſh but even to hold my ſelf almoſt in a deſart as impatient of the company of ſome of our diſtinctionary Rabbies, that admire and are ready to bleſſe themſelves

selves at the wit and profoundness of such wilde, barbarous, prophane, & senseless distinctions of this incomparable man that hath not his Peer in *England*, when in this piece of his worth there is not a ploughboy so rustick but would easily whistle so prophanely in this kinde as he: And if the reason were given to Mr. *Br.* why he is in this artifice more full than others, it might be given in the Poets words;

Non tibi plus cordis sed minus oris in est.

Bax. *pa.* 309. 3 *Paul doth by the word* [*Faith*] *especially direct your thoughts to Christ beleeved in; For to be justified by Christ, and to be justified by receiving Christ, is with him all one.*

Though I might except in some sense against this assertion; yet because I cannot apprehend waking, what he dreams sleeping, how he will from this assertion prove that *Paul* either doth not exclude works from Justification, or doth not attribute it to Faith alone, I leave it unexamined: If by Receiving Christ, he means our taking him as our Lord to be obeyed in all his Commandments that we might thereby be justified, enough hath been said before in the examination of his 66, 72, & 73 *Thes.* in answer to the fourth Argument that he brings for justification by works: unto it I refer the reader.

Bax: *ibid.* 4 *And when he mentioneth Faith as the Condition, he alwayes implyeth Obedience to Christ. Therefore beleeving and obeying the Gospel, are put for the two summaries of the whole Conditions.*

The vanity and falsity of this assertion hath been discovered in the examination of his 62, & 70 *Theses*, in which is Comprehended his Argument for Justification by works. What is there said being perused, will take off (I suppose) from the reader all expectation of any more to be here said to it. Onely by the way all may note, 1 That what he saith here labours of the same disease with the former, it is onely said not proved. We must all sit at the Feet of this *Gamaliel* and beleeve, because this great Doctor and Magister noster hath spoken it. 2 That although it be the Popish Cause which he here mainteineth, yet he with a holy Craft makes use rather of the Arminian than Popish Phrase, the more easily to beguile the simple, Calling works (not as the Papists do plainly *Works*, but) *Obedience to Christ*, and *Obedience to the Gospel*. How doth he fit his bait to be swallowed [illegible]ons that cannot discern a line from a halter. He knows [illegible] generation of men that detest swines

fleſh, yet feed every morning upon piſſles of pork as the greateſt delicacie. Change the name, and they diſaffect not the ſubſtance. 3 Yet what he here ſaith he hath received in matter though not all in words from *Stapleton* the Prieſt and his fellows. *We are juſtified* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *by Faith, not by works*; i. e. (ſaith *Stapleton*) *not by works without faith, but by works and Faith*: that is (ſaith Mr. *Br.*) [*not by works or obedience out of Faith,*] *but by works implyed in Faith.* Let him that can decide which of theſe two is the finer Sophiſter and Papiſt. 4 And no leſs harmoniouſly do *Pauls* words and Mr. *Brs* expoſition and diſtinction upon them agree together, than a harp and a harrow. *Paul* affirms Juſtification or imputation of *Righteouſneſs* to be without works, *Rom* 4. 6. Mr. *Br* expounds his meaning to be *without works which are not, but by works that are implyed in Faith.* As good a diſtinction as if I ſhould diſtinguiſh between the brains that a man hath out of his head, and the brain which he hath in his head. How great is his ſelf-Confidence that he ſhould think ſuch abſurd diſtinctions ſhould take with any rationall man, onely upon this Authority, becauſe ſuch a Cathedral ſcholar hath ſaid it? And when *Paul* ſaith ſo frequently, *Not by works but by Faith*, he ſhould mean by Faith, works alſo implyed in Faith? This were to affirm that *Paul* in the delivery of the ſacred doctrine of the Goſpel ſpeaks by Contraries, and that what things he ſetts in oppoſition we muſt take to be in a Conjunction, ſo that if he had ſaid a man ſeeth with his eyes not with his heels, we muſt underſtand him to mean that he ſeeth with his eyes and heels together, or with his heels implyed in his eyes.

What he addeth of beleeving and obeying the Goſpel, that they are *the two ſummaries of the Goſpel*, hath been before examined, and both found to be the ſame thing. Obedience to the Goſpel being nothing elſe but the hearts ſubmiſſion to the voyce of Chriſt and doctrine of the Goſpel in ſtretching forth faith to apprehend Chriſt alone to Juſtification, illumination, ſanctification, &c. reſting upon him both for ſalvation, and for grace and power to walk worthy of it, as hath been more fully before expreſſed.

Thus much in way of examination of the third part of his vindication, *viz.* that his doctrine in nothing diſſents from *Pauls*. And in this poynt I doubt not but we have found *Paul* and him no leſs Cohering, than Chriſt and Antichriſt.

CHAP. XX.

Chap. XX.

Whether there be any validity in Mr. Brs *Apologizing for his Doctrine, that it is not derogatory from the Righteousnes of Christ.*

The 4th part of his vindication is to free his doctrine [of Justification by works] from being derogatory to Christ and his righteousnes. Hereunto his endeavours bend in many parts of this his Tractate. In stead of all, I shall mention onely two or three places which Comprehend the summe and whole of all the rest.

Bax. *pa.* 307. *The Righteousnes which we must plead against the Lawes accusations, is not one grain of it in our Faith or works: but all out of us in Christs satisfaction.*

Again, Appendix *pa.* 78. *Our dooing* [or works] *are required, not to be any part of our Legall Righteousnes, nor any part of satisfaction for our unrighteousnes; but to be our Gospel Righteousnes, or the Condition of our participation in Christ, who is our Legall Righteousnes, and so of all the benefitts that come with him.*

What his meaning is he expresseth *Apbor. Thes.* 79. *pa.* 313. in a Syllogism, thus:

This Doctrine is no whit derogatory to Christ and his Righteousnes: For

He that ascribeth to Faith or obedience, no part of that work which belongeth to Christs satisfactory righteousnes, doth not derogate in that from that Righteousnes.

But he that maketh Faith and Obedience to Christ, to be onely the fulfilling of the Conditions of the New Covenant, and so to be onely Conditions of Justification by him, doth give them no part of the work of his Righteousnes: Seeing he came not to fulfill the Gospel, but the Law.

Ergo--&c.

I shall speak onely to the Syllogism, because in it is fully Comprehended all that Mr. *Br.* hath to say for the vindication of his doctrine from so fowl a scandal and blemish. And here I shall in the first place onely minde the reader of what hath been before Copiously (in its place) manifested, that Mr. *Br.* takes up this Feat of arguing from the Papists, who to Clear their doctrine of Merit and

Justification by works, from being derogatory to Christ and his Merits, do plead against us, That they in no wise lessen the Merits of Christ, by teaching that good works do Merit and Justifie: But that herein they advance the Merits of Christ in ascribing to them this soveraign vertue and power, to give validity and worth to mans good works to Merit and Justifie. Nay the Hereticks (say they) degrade the Merits of Christ, in teaching that mans works cannot Justifie or Merit, as if there were not force enough in Christs Merits to enable them to it. Whether theirs or Mr. *Brs* Argumentation have more shew of reason to support it, I leave to the intelligent reader to judge.

2 The whole Argument is Sophisticall and fallacious: 1 In that his Argument is not full and wide to the proving of his position. The position which by this Argument he pretends to Confirm, is in his own words, that *This doctrine* [of his] *is no whit derogatory to Christ and his Righteousness.* But his Argument is shapen onely to prove, that his doctrine doth not derogate from Christs righteousness, not that it doth not derogate from Christ himself. Were it granted that it doth not derogate from Christs righteousness, yet it follows not that it doth not derogate from Christ, any more than if a man should ascribe all due praises to Mr. *Brs* learning, but should deny his honesty, Charity, Chastity, verity, or other like vertue in him; yet because he doth not derogate from the learning of the man, he doth not derogate from the man himself in any of his accomplishments. Mr. *Brs* doctrine may derogate from Christ in veiling his grace, mercy, and fullnes in other Conditions required to the Compleating of his Mediatorship, though it did (where it doth not) ascribe to his Righteousness its due praise and fullness. 2 In that he playes with equivocation of words: For to shun the deserved hatred which the Papists doctrine incurreth from the Saints of Christ, he delivers their doctrine not in theirs but in the Arminian phrase, putting under the name and in stead of [*good works*] *Obedience to Christ*: For this is an equivocall phrase, and as oft as it is used in the New Testament in order to Justification, it is the same thing with Faith, and differs not a whit from it. *The obedience of Faith, obeying of the Gospel, and obedience to Christ*, signifying nothing else but the deniall of our selves and our own righteousness, and our trusting in Christ alone for Justification and Salvation, as Christ and his Gospel Command; in opposition to the voyce of the Law that [*knowing nothing of Christ, speaking*

false]

saith] saith, *Doe and work that thou mayest be saved*, Gal. 3. 12. But Mr. *Br.* takes this obedience to Christ not in that Gospel but in this legall sense, for the fulfilling of the Moral works which the Law requireth, to intereſſe us in the juſtification which is by Christ, and ſo deceives his reader with the homonymy of the phraſe. 3 In putting a reſtricting in his Argument, upon the Righteouſneſs of Christ, which in his poſition that he was to prove was left at large and in generall, *Christ and* H I S *Righteouſneſs*: but in the Argument he putts a limitation upon it in the Major, *That Righteouſneſs*, which alſo he explaineth to be onely the *Satisfactory Righteouſneſs of Christ*: as if there were no other but *that righteouſneſs* in Christ, & whoſoever derogates not from it could not derogate at all from Christs righteouſneſs. I may ſubſcribe to the righteouſneſs of Mr. *Br.* in ſome Acts of his, though I onely deſire but finde it not in other. Many other Acts of righteouſneſs were required in Christ (even as he is our Mediator) beſides that by which he gave ſatisfaction to Juſtice for our Sinns, without which his ſatisfactory righteouſneſs becomes unavaileable to us. And he that derogates not from the one, may derogate from the other. Yet ſee we the boldneſs of our Sophiſter, what he reſtreigneth in the propoſition about Christs righteouſneſs, in the Aſſumpcion he leaves indefinite, looſe, generall, and without reſtriction again, not [*that*] righteouſneſs, but [*H I S*] Righteouſneſs: ſo making his Argument, by his fallacy of four terms, to run four-footed. 4 By begging the queſtion in Calling good works (which with him is the ſame with *Obedience to Christ*) *the Condition of the New Covenant and Juſtification by Christ*. Well doth he put it upon himſelf, ſaying, *He that maketh them ſuch*, for neither God nor Christ ever made them ſuch. 5 His Activity and Liegerdemain, which he uſeth to draw off his reader from Conſidering the palpable ſophiſtry uſed in this Argument. This he ſeeks to do by giving and proſecuting in the explication of this *Theſis*, a ſeeming reaſon that he bringeth to prove his aſſumption; *viz.* that *Christ came not to fulfill the Goſpel but the Law*, and then ſpending his whole explication about it. When (not to ſpeak how equivocall and ambiguous the phraſe is, and in its moſt literal and grammatical ſenſe the aſſertion altogether falſe) we utterly deny, either that Christ hath fulfilled the words of the Law or the Goſpel in our ſtead, otherwiſe than by giving ſatisfaction by his death for our infirm and maimed fulfilling of them; or that works do or to juſtifie us are as all works of the Goſpel, but are contrariwiſe

wise wholly works of the Law; or that Christ hath any more satisfied for our infirmities in fulfilling the works of the Law than of the Gospel, in that sense in which Mr. *Br.* distinguisheth them. It was his part not to say but to prove soundly his assertion, if he would not have it exploded for a new and vain fancy, rather than to have answered in his explication, objections of his own making that scarce touch upon the matter in question.

This might suffice as a full answer to his Argument, to have proved it in so many particulars to be unargumentall, no argument, or a faulty argument, not a Syllogism but a Para-logism. Yet not to leave an occasion to any of excepting that the propositions of the syllogism may have some force in them or either of them apart from other, to his purpose; I shall afford the labour to examine them also.

To the Consequent of the Major I have many things to say. 1 That it is (as the whole Argument) sophistical, a meer declining of not a speaking to the question; The word [*in that*] is foysted in besides the question, and makes that which is said unsaid, altogether besides the question. That which he undertakes to prove, is (in his own words) that *His doctrine is no whit derogatory from Christ and his Righteousnes.* To prove this see how grossly he acts the Sophister to beguile fools, in stead of a Logician to satisfie the intelligent. He that ascribeth (saith he) [*to works or*] *obedience, no part of that work which belongeth to Christs satisfactory Righteousnes, doth not derogate* [*in that*] *from that Righteousnes.* No less true than the Gospel, but so farr from the question as the earth is from heaven. For who ever questioned whether the not ascribing to works that which belongeth to Christs satisfactory righteousnes, be a derogating from that righteousnes? Yea it were madnes in any to question it. For if the not ascribing should so derogate, then God, Christ, Spirit, Word, Apostles, Prophets, all Protestants, yea all animate and inanimate Creatures without understanding, should be guilty of derogating from Christs satisfactory righteousnes. For none of these ascribe to works any part of that work which belongeth to that righteousnes of Christ. How palpable is this cheat which Mr. *Br.* would put upon us? He that doth not ascribe &c. doth not derogate *in that*, i.e. in his not ascribing to mans works what belongs to Christ, from Christ. By the like Argumentation might I clear himself from the guilt of murther Committed upon ever better men than himself; and Christs Tormentors themselves from ...

ving

ying any hand in his death: Thus might they learn of Mr. *Br.* to plead; They that wound not, that keep a mans head from wounding, do not *in that* take away his life. True, the not wounding of the head was not prejudiciall to the life of them whom they slew. But the wounding and piercing of their bodies and shedding out their bowells, made them as actually murtherers, as if they had also dashed out the brains of them whom they slew. It was not what they did not, but what they did that Constituted them guilty of murther. So it is not Mr. *Brs* not ascribing but his ascribing to works that derogates from Christ. Shall we thinke that Mr. *Br.* slumbered and dosted into this fallacy? Is he a puny that he should need to be taught how to express himself in an argument? Nay all must see that he knowes it to be a heterodox and desperate Conclusion which he maintaineth, that no honest and holy means can pillar up; therefore tramples all ingenuity under-foot, running over it to fetch patronage from his Sophistry. And even herein bewraies the high thoughts that he hath of himself, that all his flies are Eagles, and his grosse Conceptions oracles; and his abasing of all others, that they are so blinde as not to see, and so blunt as to be all taken in his rook-nets.

Or if we take his meaning thus, That his doctrine in making Works a Collaterall with Faith to Justification, (which he would say plainly if he meant not fraudulently, and had not his own judgement and Conscience suggesting to him the weakness & falshood of such an assertion) because it ascribeth no part of the work of Christs satisfactory righteousness to works, doth not derogate from Christ and his righteousness: Then I deny both the Consequent and Consequence of the Proposition. For 1. It derogates from him and it a full potency and efficacy to justifie any one, untill it be animated and enlivened by our own works to do it, leaving it all feeble & dead to produce its effect untill our obedience as its Concause gives life to it. And this is Contradictive to the doctrine of the Apostle, who asserteth the efficacy and actuall efficiency of Christ and his righteousness to justifie us *yet ungodly*, Rom. 4. 5. yet without strength [to work] yet *sinners*, yet *enemies*, and so workers against him, Rom. 5. 6, 8, 9, 10. 2. It derogates from its glory, in parting and dividing our Justification between his righteousness & our righteousness; so ascribing part of the praise to man which ought to be attributed full and entire to Christ. This also is contrary to the doctrine of the Apostle, that excludes

works

works under every notion from having to do in the business of Justification, *to exclude Boasting, lest any man should boast, or glory in himself*, Rom. 3. 27. & 4. 2. Eph. 2. 9. *But that He that glorieth may glory in the Lord*, 1 Cor. 1. 29, 30, 31.

Nay it doth not onely derogate from, but totally destroy and nullifie the righteousness of Christ, as to us and our justification. For so first the Apostle testifieth, *Christ is become of no effect to you, whosoever of you are justified by the Law*, Gal. 5. 4. And to be justified by the Law, or by the works of the Law, are with the Apostle the same thing, as hath been oft shewed before. Yea to seek justification in any part or degree by the works or obedience which the Law requireth as a Condition of Justification, is to seek to be Justified by the Law. Works being the Condition of Justification by the Law and not by Grace. 2 Because it obstructeth the way of Justification which Christ hath made and sends poor souls to seek it in a way that is impervious, by which there can be no access to Christ his righteousness. For the righteousness of Christ is given of free Love, pure grace, meer mercy; as a *free Gift*, Rom. 5. 15. *Freely offered and received*, Rev. 22. 17. *Without money and without price*, Isa. 55. 1. He is the worst Simoniak that seeks to buy this gift of the Holy Ghost for money, to make it his by his own Merit and obedience. Whosoever is admitted to it, such a one is rejected from it: For *Christ came to call not the Righteous but sinners to repentance. The Publicans and Harlots enter when these are excluded. They shall come from the East and from the West* &c. *From all parts of Paganism and Barbarism, that shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdome of God*, in the possession of grace and righteousness by Christ: *but these that think themselves in their own righteousness to be the children of the kingdome shall be cast out with the Jewes*, into whose doctrine & manners they are naturallized. And justly, For he that worketh, *i. e.* brings works to inright him to Justification, Challengeth it *as Debt* from Gods Justice, as the fruit of his own work & Merit that God oweth to him, not as a free gift from his grace, *Rom.* 4. 4. Who will envie to him the fruit of his deservings? This is Condemnation from the Tribunall of Justice where no flesh can be justified; when they which [*work not*] *but believe on him which Justifieth the ungodly*, *i. e.* which bring Faith alone without works as Coadjutors to put them into the actuall and sensible possession of the righteousness which is by Christ; these even these alone shall be justified at the throne of grace, *Rom.* 4. 5. Why? these seek it in the way where God

is present to give it: The other in a way wherein God never was, never will be present to bestow it.

Lastly I deny the Assumption also. It is false that Mr. *Br.* making (so as he doth it) Obedience or Works the condition of Justification by Christ, doth not give them any part of the work of Christs righteousnes. For it belongeth to Christs righteousnes by it self alone, and to Christ by his Mediatory righteousnes alone to perfect for ever the Justification and salvation of his redeemed ones, *Heb.* 10. 14. And that without any accessary help of their own righteousnes, *John* 13. 10. But Mr. *Br.* so parteth justification between Christs righteousnes and our righteousnesse, as that he makes them equally concurrent to our salvation and justifying: That Christs Righteousnes without ours can no more profit us, than ours without Christs: yea makes Christs righteousnes wholly unprofitable to every man, till by the serving and deserving of each man it be purchased and made usefull to benefit him. And so by making the efficacy of it the fruit of our Merit, he dis-robes it of its honour and ornament, derogating from it its all-sufficiency by it self to perfect us, that he may arrogate to our righteousnes what is stoln from his. But how farr this doctrine of his derogates both from the grace of God, and merits of Christ hath been oft discussed. After all that hee hath said to the defacing of both, here he wipes his mouth, and saith it was never foul: and will have his Reader conclude, that when his face of Christ is spittled, yet if it be from Mr. *Brs.* lips touched with a Cole from *Bellarmine* and *Arminius*, it is a blessing of him.

This one truth I acknowledg, implyed, though not expressed in this Argument of Mr. *Br.* that he acknowledgeth himself to be the man that hath made obedience or works condition of the New Covenant, or of justification by Christ. In this I contradict him not. It is of mans, not of Gods making, it's a creature of his own, not created by God, at least not by God assigned to this use and end. It being therefore not formed to his hand, but a graven image, the work of his own hand, we leave him (sith he will do it) alone without us to persist in worshipping it.

Chap. XXIII.

Whether the Reasons which hee bringeth prove him not to be a Legallist and Anti-gospeller.

His fifth endeavour is to vindicate his doctrine from being legall and Anti-Evangelicall: That although it hold Beleevers not only under the bondage, but also under the Curse of the Law, in life and death till the day of Judgment, *Thes.* 9. *pa.* 65. & p. 73. and else-where oft: Though it makes works the condition of the New, as well as of the Old Covenant; though he maintains that *Doe and Live*, is the voyce of the Gospel as well as of the Law, *Append.* p. 81. Yet is he not a *Pharisee* or Legallist, nor his doctrine ungospel-like; It is purely Christian, and full of sweet and ravishing Consolation to a Beleever, not the least tangue of the Covenant of works, but the odour and very marrow of the Covenant of grace in it. It would be too long to set forth in his own words all the reasons that scatteringly throughout this Book of his hee bringeth to prove a probability and likelihood of truth in this his Paradox. The sum of it is this.

B. 1. *As to the bondage and Curse of the Law, though they that are in Christ are under it in part, yet they are not under it in the whole, as all sinners under the Law, wholly out of Christ. For they are conditionally pardoned and justified* [*as he frequently expresseth himself*] *and so there is some ground of hope, to take off the extreamity of despair. And it is not the whole, but some part of the Curse of the Law that lyeth upon them*, p. 65. Thes. 9. *Christs death hath suspended the* RIGOROUS *execution of the sentence of the Law, that it doth not immediately fall upon his Redeemed ones*, p. 67. *though they suffer, after they are in Christ, much of the Curse in execution of the threatning of the Law,* [*and that not without rigour*] *yet is it not in its full rigour*, p. 69. *And Christ who hath suspended the rigour of the Curse, manageth that which lyeth on them to their good and advantage*, pag. 72. And is not this cordiall Gospel? the balm of *Gilead*? and the healing of Christs wings to a wounded soul?

The force of all this hath been examined already, as else-where, so most copiously in the Examination of his ninth *Thesis*, and the explication thereof, to which for the prevention of Tautologizing

zing here, I refer the Reader. Only let him by the way consider with me how fitly these glosses of Mr. Br. do agree with many plain and evident Scriptures. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us*, Gal. 3. 13. *i. e.* saith M. Br. from the rigour of the Curse, not from the Curse it self, for it lyeth upon us still: or from the Curse, that it shall not follow us to heaven after the world is ended; not but that untill the worlds end it shall torment us both dead and living. *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walke not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit*, Rom. 8. 1. *i. e.* No condemnation in its full rigour, but condemnation unto, and the execution of the Curse they must bear untill the day of judgment, and after that he knoweth not what will become of them. *Blessed is the man whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sinns are covered*, Rom. 4. 7. *i. e.* in part blessed, and in part cursed. *The blood of Christ purgeth from all sin*, 1 Joh. 1. 7. *i. e.* from all sin, not from all the curse and vengeance due to any one of our sins are we delivered. *God for Christs sake hath forgiven you all your sins and tresspasses*, Eph. 4. 32. Col. 2. 13. *i. e.* hath forgiven you the fault, but not the curse and punishment. *By one offering, Christ hath perfected for ever them that are sanctifird, i. e.* hath laid a ground to perfect them if he will in the next world, not that he hath perfected them in point of Justification here. The time past is put for a time to come, and a certain for an uncertain time. *Heb.* 10. 14. *They that are once purged by sacrifice, have no more conscience of sinn*, i. e. when they are wholly purged in heaven, not while they are but in part purged upon earth. *Heb.* 10. 2. *Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more*, Heb. 10. 17. *i. e.* no more as forgiven to spare them: But as long as the Sun and Moon endure, I will remember to pour out the Curse and vengeance for them. *Wee are justified by the blood, and reconciled to the Father by the death of the Son*, Rom. 5. 9, 10. That is, we have right and title so to be reconciled and justified in another world, if we lose it not by the way. *He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities, and with his stripes we are healed*, Isa. 53. 5. *i. e.* So healed with his stripes that he shall wound us again with the strokes of his Curse so sorely, that we shall be healed no more while the world lasteth. *I have sworn that I would no more be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee*, Isa. 54 9. *i. e.* I have sworn, but never meant to stand to it. I might instance hundreds more of such Scriptures, wherewith Mr. Brs. glosses and distinctions do as well agree as fire & towe together. If Mr. Br. did

ſo much honour the very intrals of Gods word, as hee doth the backſide of *Ariſtotles* Topicks, he would not dare ſo to elude and elide them. But Gods authority with him muſt (it ſeems) ſtand or fall, as it hath or hath not approbation from *Ariſtotles* or *Socinus* his Reaſon, being ſubmitted to the cenſure thereof. And then what living plant of God can ſtand, where this man brings the Axe of his diſtinctions to fell and prepare billets in heaps for his Cole-fires?

B. 2. *As to the Covenant of works, though he make them Concomitants with Faith in juſtifying, and that the voyce of the New C: is (after his Aſſertion) the ſame with the voyce of the Old,* Do, and Live, *yet he denies his doctrine to be herein Legall: Becauſe there is a manifold difference implyed, though not expreſſed between the Lawes and the Goſpels juſtifying by works.* 1 *The Law requireth an obedience or righteouſneſs of works in every number and degree perfect, to juſtification: But hee makes the New Covenant or Goſpell to require only ſincere obedience, or obedience perfect in ſincerity for the attainment of this end,* Aph. *pa.* 133. *&* 316. *and* Theſ. 77. *pa.* 310. *and* App. *pa.* 76, 77. *And the ſincere covenanting of this obedience, or this ſincere obedience covenanted, muſt be thus conditioned, elſe it is not ſincere.* 1 *It muſt follow upon the knowledg of the Nature, ends, & conditions of the Covenant.* 2 *It muſt be done deliberately, and not in a fit of paſſion, or raſhly.* 3 *It muſt be done ſeriouſly, and not diſſemblingly, or ſlightly.* 4 *Freely and heartily, and not through meer conſtraint and fear.* 5 *Intirely, and with a reſolution to perform the* [*whole*] *Covenant, and not with reſervations, giving themſelves to Chriſt by the halves, or reſerving a purpoſe to maintain their fleſhly intereſts.* 6 *It muſt be the taking and obeying of Chriſt alone, not joyning others in office with him, but renouncing all other happineſs, ſave what is by him, and all government and ſalvation from any, which is not in direct ſubordination to him,* Append. *pa.* 33. *Theſe make up a ſincere and perfect obedience, a ſincere and perfect Goſpel-righteouſneſs, perfect in reſpect of Evangelicall, though not of legall perfection. For ſincerity is our Goſpel-perfection, being a conformity to the rule of perfection, viz. the New Covenant as it is a Covenant, a perfection of ſufficiency in order to its end, which is to be the condition of Juſtification,* Aph. p. 132, 133. [Who now is there of all men that hath eyes in his elbows, but ſeeth diſtinctly

ly a vast difference between the Laws and the Gospels justifying by works. For it is justice which requires perfect, but Grace that requireth but sincere obedience to justification.

All this is without book, the dictates not of the Holy Ghost, but of Mr. Br. and that spirit which wrought in his Masters from whom he learned it. For 1. The Scriptures which he alledgeth in any part of this Treatise to make any part thereof probable, have been examined, and none of them found to speak for him, most against him. Neither do these assertions of Scripture that affirm Christ to give, or promise that he will give life, salvation, &c. to such or such qualified or working persons, [as to them that love him, or fear him, or obey him, or to the meek, the righteous, &c.] any more infer that these qualifications or works have any proper or improper causality to produce their justification; than when the Scriptures affirm him to give grace and life to Centurions, Publicans, Harlots, Sinners, Enemies, Ungodly, Chief sinners, Samaritans, Heathen, do infer, that their being such had any causality unto their justification.

2. Nay the Scriptures utterly deny the Gospel to have to do with the Law in this voyce, *Do, and Live*, as I have before oft alleged them. *Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but of his Mercy he hath saved us, by Faith not of works. Not of workes, but of Grace.* And how poor a shift Mr. *Br.* useth to elude the force of these and the like Scriptures, hath been shewed in the examination of his vindicating himself from being contradictive to St. *Paul.*

3. Yea if works in any notion or consideration be brought as coupled with Faith to promote Justification, the Scriptures affirm them to destroy the hope of Justification, and to repell the grace of Christ, by which the Beleevers are justified. *If ye be circumcised* (which in *Pauls* sense there is, If yee bring but this one work to forward your Justification by Christ) *ye are bound to keep the whole law; Christ is become of no effect, ye are fain from grace, and fain under the Curse*, Gal. 5. 3, 4. & 3. 10.

4. And if works or obedience in Mr. *Brs.* sense (which is the doing of the moral Righteousness that the Law commandeth) be not as much as adjuvant to Justification, then surely sincere obedience cannot be helpful, where obedience, yea perfect obedience is excluded. This is, and appears to be either an instinct, or a distinction of Mr. *Brs.* own brain, not a doctrine of the Scripture, for which

which way shall we turn the leaves thereof to find it?

5. Yea, how rational, or how ridiculous this distinction or glois of Mr. *Br.* applyed to those Scriptures which deny justification by the obedience of works, I leave both to the seeing and the blind to judg. *By the works of the law no flesh shall be justified,* saith the Apostle, *i. e.* saith Mr. Br. by the perfect obedience of works, but by unperfect obedience, if sincere, we may be justified. *Not of works but of grace,* i. e. not of works perfectly done, but of works unperfectly, yet sincerely done: so grace and works may be made friends, that is, Gods grace and mans vain glory may kiss each other as co-equal workers of mans justification. *Not by works of Righteousnes which we have done, but of his mercy,* &c. i. e. which we have done perfectly, but which we have done maimedly, yet sincerely. If some *Festus* should hear such a Commentary of Mr. Br. upon *Paul,* he would conclude sure, *that one of them is beside himself, much learning hath made him mad.* Either *Paul,* that he had not wit or words to express his own meaning, that in the whole bulk of his disputes, denying unto our works and righteousnes indefinitely, all operation to Justification, & doth not as much as with a Parenthesis, in any place inform his Reader that he speaks not of Gospel, but of legall works, not of sincere, but of perfect obedience; that these are rejected from, those necessarily required to justification: Or Mr. Br. that without craving leave of *Paul,* by such gross distinctions goes about to make him unsay what he hath said, and the world to believe, that in all what he wrote of Justification, hee meant to be understood on the contrary to what hee speaketh.

6. If we bring works at all to procure justification by Christ, we do by evacuating the grace of God and merits of Christ to our selves, oblige & put a bondage upon our selves to fulfil the whole Law legally in its perfection, else can we never be justified, but abide under the Curse for ever. For *he that worketh, requireth the reward as a debt in law, and not as a gift of grace;* therefore, except his work be so perfect, as that it can in strict justice save him, hee can never *attain salvation,* as by comparing together these Scriptures will be evident, *viz. Gal.* 5. 3, 4. & 3. 10. *Rom.* 4. 4, 5. & 9. 30, 31, 32.

7. As to the rules or qualifications which he gives to covenanting and obedience that it may be sincere, they are in substance meerly legal, *the Name of Christ* being only put in head of the *Name*

of

of God. And who is there not only of the Jesuits & *Socinians*, with the *Arminians*, from whom he borroweth most of his principles, but even of the reall *Antinomians*, whom he pretends to oppose, who in all those particulars thinks not himself, or gives not cause to all to think them as sincere as Mr. *Br*? what ground have we to conclude but that they know the ends, nature and conditions of the Covenant so truly, and obey with so much deliberation and as little fittishness and rashness; so seriously, without dissimulation and slightness; so freely, intirely, and singly, as Mr. *Br.* doth? Thus every stigmatized Heretick in his own way, bringing with him such a sincerity of obedience, shall thereby be possessed of the investiture of Christs righteousness, though he seek it in his own, not in Gods way, by his own righteousness, and not by Faith alone, which alone God hath stamped with an aptitude and efficacy to this work.

B. 2. *The Law (saith he) requireth obedience and doing, by its own righteousness to justifie us: but the Gospel requireth it as a Medium to acquire to us Christs Righteousness by which wee may be justified. So that the one requires works to justifie us without, the other the same works to justifie us by a Mediator.* This he saith so frequently in substance, that it were lost labour to quote the places.

And it hath been almost so oft answered as said. Therefore I shall referr the Reader to the places where it hath been answered, and specially to the examination of those his disputes in which he labours to cleer his doctrine from all tincture of Popery, from all contradiction to *Paul*, and from being derogatory to Christ, & his righteousnes. Here only I add, that this doctrine is the same with that of the most legal Pharisees, against whom the Apostle so much inveigheth, wishing them *accursed & cut off, for troubling the Churches* therwith, *Gal.* 1 9. & 5. 12. For they arrogated to themselves alone part in Christ & his Righteousnes, because of their own personall righteousness in the works and obedience which the Law requireth; resisting the Gentiles, & denying to them all possibility to partake in the Justification which is by Christ, by means of Faith alone, except they also fulfilled the righteousnesse which the Law required to give them right to him and it. Yea Mr. *Br.* [with these] ascribes more to works than the very unbeleeving Pharisees. For these claymed Justification only by their works; but he and the beleeving Pharisees challenged for their works, right both

in

in the Juſtifier and in his juſtification alſo: For *Cauſa cauſæ eſt etiam cauſa cauſati.* As farr as they aſcribe to their works a Cauſality to make Chriſt theirs, they make them cauſal to render the Juſtification which is by Chriſt theirs alſo.

B. 3. *That neither is his Doctrine legall, nor doth he aſcribe too much to works, becauſe he maketh Faith and obedience to be but a Condition, or a Medium, or a poor improper* Cauſa ſine qua non, *of our Juſtification,* Aph. pa. 223, 224. *and our doing no part of ſatisfaction for our unrighteouſneſs* (for this hee ſeems to have aſcribed before to our ſufferings in bearing the Curſe) *but to be our Goſpel-Righteouſneſs, or the Condition of our participation in Chriſt who is our legall Righteouſneſs, & ſo of all the benefits that come by him,* App. p. 78. *I ſay, that ſubjection and obedience juſtifie.* 1 *Not as works ſimply conſidered:* 2 *Nor as legall works:* 3 *Nor as meritorious works:* 4 *Nor as good works which God is pleaſed with:* 5 *But as Conditions to which the free Law-giver hath promiſed Juſtification and life.*

Nay your (i. e. *the Proteſtants*) *doctrine aſcribeth farr more of the work to man than mine; For you make Juſtification an effect of your own Faith, and your faith an inſtrumentall cauſe of it, and ſo make your ſelf your own Juſtifier. And you ſay your faith juſtifieth as it apprehendeth Chriſt, which is the moſt intrinſicall, eſſentiall conſideration of Faith; & ſo faith hath much of the Honour. But while I affirm that it juſtifieth only as a condition, which is an extrinſicall conſideration, and alien from its eſſence and Nature, I give the glory to him that freely giveth me life, and that made ſo ſweet a condition to his Covenant, and that enableth me to perform the ſaid Condition,* App. pag. 120, 121.

All this hath been oft and fully examined before in its place alſo, and how little truth there is in any part or parcell thereof diſcovered. It would be wearineſs to the fleſh, and vexation to the Spirit, but to look ſo often upon his great *Goddeſs*, his *Queen of Heaven* [*CONDITION*] as he bleſſeth her. O that his conſcience had been ſo well acquainted with Chriſt, as his fancy is with this Idoll; he would not then have peſtered the Church with ſuch an imaginary Deity, nor proſtituted all that is called God at the feet of ſuch a *Proſerpina*. I am weary any more to attend to him, making the will of God, *i. e.* God willing conditional, and

ſo

so the immutable God a conditional God, the salvation of Christ conditional, & so Christ a conditional Saviour; or the witness & seal of Christ a conditional seal and witness, and so the Holy Ghost a conditional Spirit of Adoption; or the gospel of righteousness, forgiveness, and life, a conditional Gospel, and consequently nulling all these, and pronouncing them no God, no Christ, no Holy Ghost, no Gospel. For a conditional proposition doth *Nihil ponere*, and after Mr. Brs. principles, it is in mans righteousness to give or destroy the actual existence of every of these. But I leave to him that delights therein to bury himself in this gulph. I conceive my self obnoxious to censure for spending and spilling so many words already, to shew the deformity and uglineſs of this imaginary *Chimera*. Here therefore it shall suffice (leaving the Reader to the perusall of what hath been said already upon this subject) to mind him of these two things.

1. That both the whole and every least fragment of all that is here collected, whether we look to the substance or Artifice used about it, is not his, but borrowed partly from the Papists, partly from the *Socinians*, and their Apes the *Arminians*, as hath been before shewed: and if I shall be called thereto, I am ready more fully to shew, by quoting the Authors, out of whom he hath transcribed all almost word for word, to his use: So that the Reader may consult with such of our Writers, that have answered their sophistry, if he desire to read more fully and largely upon this subject, and not expect it from mee who have already transgressed (as some will judg) by my too much largeness therein, as to Mr. Baxter.

2. That although the voyce here be the voyce of *Jacob*, yet the hands are the hands of *Esau*. Sweet words, but subverting doctrine in matter and substance. Pills of poyson wrapt up in gold, we except not against the gold, but the poyson therein inclosed, not against the Terms of words considered by themselves, but against the pernicious doctrine which they palliate. Whether we ascribe too much to Faith by making it an instrument, see the examination of his answer to the last question which he propoundeth in the explication of *Thes.* 56. But how false and fallacious his flattering words which he useth here to make tolerable, yea sweet his arrogant doctrine of Justification by works (viz. *that Wee, that is, and the Papists, with* Socinus *and* Arminius, *make our righteousnesse but a Condition, or Medium, or a poor improper* Causa sine qua non, *no*

part of satisfaction for our unrighteousnes, Not as works simply considered, nor as Legall works, nor as Meritorious works, Nor as good works with which God is pleased, but as our Gospel-righteousnes, and conditions to which the free Law-giver hath promised justification and life) will easily appear to him that considereth what & how much hee ascribeth to works. Though he cals works a poor *Causa sine qua non*, yet himself affirmeth that some *Causes sine qua non, deserve farr greater praise in morall respect, than some that have a proper Causality, &c*, Aph. *pa.* 216. wch though in words he deny of Faith (meaning by faith all obedience and good works which hee calls the severall Acts of Faith, *Aph.* p. 126.) that it doth so deserve, *Aphor.* p. 224. yet in matter and substance he affirms it. And

Nulla fides verbis cum res adversa loquatur.

For as I have more than hinted before,

1 He maketh our righteousnes of works and Christs satisfactory righteousnes, co-ordinate and collateral in the procurement of our Justification, the one as absolutely necessary as the other to the attainment of this end; the one to purchase a possibility of Justification, the other to render that which was but in possibility, actual and effectual to us: Both satisfactory, the one as a sufficient Fine and payment, the other as satisfactory Rent and homage, *Aph. Thes.* 17, 18, 19. *pa.* 129.

2 He puts both in the same order and kind of Causes, making our righteousnes and Christs satisfaction to be both the *Causa sine qua non*, *Thes.* 56. For although he names Faith there, yet himself declares himselfe under Faith to mean and comprehend obedience also. This Civility alone he vouchsafeth to Christ, that he names Christs satisfaction before our faith or obedience, because it seems that is the elder. But in order, power and authority, to the producing of this effect, Christ hath no pre-eminence given him above man.

3 He affirms mans righteousnes to be as perfect as Christs righteousnes in order to Justification, *viz.* both *perfect* [*in suo genere*] Christs righteousnes perfect to do its work, & mans to its work; or (as he explains himself) both perfect in *the perfection of sufficiency in order to its end.* So that here also is a parity, no efficiency in Christs righteousnes without mans, nor in mans without Christs to justifie. But when the two perfections meet, if neither lose its perfection, they may after the world is ended, perfect our justification, *Thes.* 24. p. 132. In the mean while, till our works be added

added to Christs satisfaction, what he saith of faith, that he every where implyeth of the satisfaction of Christ, *that it is dead being alone, as to the use and purpose of justifying. And so as works make faith alive, so they make Christs satisfaction alive, as to the attainment of its end,* justification.

4 *That works justifie in the same kind of Causality and procurement with faith*, not only proving Faith to be found, *but themselves being in the same obligation with Faith, not idle Concomitants, only standing by while Faith doth all* (which some fools might imagine hee meaneth, when he calls them onely necessary Antecedents of Justification, pa. 223.) *Nay they are Concomitants with Faith in the* [very *Act of*] *procuring it, and in that kind of Causality which they have,* p. 299, 300.

5 *They do all this as they are works. Even Faith it self justifieth, as it is an Act of ours,* Append. p. 80. *and as a morall duty,* Append. p. 102. *So do all other Morall duties as they are part of our sincere obedience to Christ,* ibid.

6 That we are justified not only by works, *Apb.* p. 300. and according to our works, but *also for our works,* pa. 320. that *good works are a ground and Reason of it,* p. 221.

7 That we are justified for our works, that is, for the *Merit of them.* Not Merit in the most proper and strict sense, *which is the performance of some what not due* (*by one that is not under the Soveraignty of him to whom it is performed*) *of that worth in it selfe, which bindeth him to whom it is done, in strict and naturall justice to requite him. Such an obligation can no creature lay upon God*; Neither could perfect obedience, in respect of the Law of Works (if man had continued still upright) have so merited. [But so far as it was possible for a perfect man to have merited under the Covenant of works] hee may now merit also under the Covenant of Grace by his works, *viz.* In an improper *way of Meriting: where the obligation to reward is Gods Ordinate Justice, and the truth of his promise, and the worthinesse lyeth in the performance of the Condition on our part.* [Thus farr might *Adam* in his perfection have merited according to the Law of works, and so farr may wee merit according to the Covenant of Grace.] *Apportion, Thes.* 26. & pa. 138. 140, 141.

Let all this be laid together, and who can but per-force acknowledge together with the horns of the Lamb, the voyce of the Dragon also? and all that he hath spoken pretendedly to the di-

minution of works, under the fine terms of his [*causa sine qua non*, his Gospel Condition, and necessary Antecedents] to be really but a Cloke to hide his diminution of Christ and exaltation of sinfull man? A *Syrens* song to draw poor souls to dash against the Rocks and be drowned in the gulph? Why had he not made our works conjunctly with Christs satisfaction, in his *Thes.* 56. the *procatarctick and meritorious cause of our Justification, as well as he doth the satisfaction of Christ conjunctly with our Faith* [or obedience] in the same Thesis *the Causa sine qua non thereof?* Had he so done, could he have ascribed more to works, under the name of a Meritorious cause, then he doth under the title of a poor improper *Causa sine qua non?* But by so doing he should have shewed himself in the light, which contrariwise *he that doth evill hateth the light, neither cometh to the light lest his deeds should be reproved.* Let now any of his Disciples produce (I will not say one *Arminian*, but) one *Socinian*, *Papist*, yea or *Jew*, that ascribes more to works, then this man, in derogation from Christ and Grace, else let him cease to be a follower of him, or openly and ingenuously profess that he followeth him as a *Jew*, *Papist*, or *Socinian*, and consequently that he hath made not Mr. *Br.* but Mr *Brs* Masters his Master also in the doctrine of Justification: And that in advancing self so high, as to affirm he meriteth no less fully and properly then Christ himself hath or could have done: For, his merits are in order to Gods ordinate not naturall justice. But to shew the vanity of his distinction here, how carelesly he eludeth the holy Scriptures as meer shadows and play-games, the Apostle denyeth man in this or that, or in any sense to be justified by works. He saith not, *Not by works*, [as the efficient or meritorious cause, or as the Medium, or Antecedent, or Condition, or *Causa sine qua non*] *lest any man should boast*, but positively and peremptorily, not by Works as by Faith, yea not by works in any acceptation, upon any score and accompt. Mr. *B.* chippings therfore have no more force then a chip to make the Holy Ghost to unsay what he hath said. And it is as good sense as if I should say, Mans bread doth not apparrell him, as it is the maker, or matter, or instrument, or merit of his clothing, but as it is the antecedent, or medium, or condition, or *Causa sine qua non* of his apparrelling, when contrariwise it doth not at all in any sense apparrell him.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIV.

Mr. Baxters *Sophism to prove that his Doctrine of Justification by Works, doth not at all derogate from the Doctrine of Faith, examined, and found to be meer vanity.*

BEcause the Scripture attributeth Justification to Faith without works, and to Faith in opposition to works, excluding works and requiring Faith alone to apprehend the Righteousnesse which is by Christ, and denominating it the *Righteousnesse of Faith*, Rom. 4. 11. *The Righteousnesse which is of Faith*, Rom. 9.30. & 10. 6. in opposition *to the Righteousnesse of works*. He easily seeth that he shall be excepted against for his antiscripturall doctrine in making Faith and works Concomitants in the same kind of causality and procurement of Justification. Therefore he makes it his sixth task to vindicate this his doctrine from all derogation from Faith, and from all unscripturall confounding of Faith and works together. To prove himself as innocent in this as in all the rest, he brings these Reasons.

Ch. Thes. 62. 1 *Because though he makes Works and Faith to be the Conditions of our Justification yet (according to Scripture phrase) Faith may be called the onely Condition of the New Covenant,* 1 *Because it is the principall Condition, and works but the lesse principall: And so as a whole Countrey burh oft its name from the chief City, so may the Conditions of this Covenant from Faith.* 2. *Because all the rest are reducible to it; Either being presupposed as necessary Antecedents or means, or contained in it as its parts, properties, or modifications; or else implyed as its immediate products, or necessary subservient means or consequents.*

All without Book, one of Mr Brs Mysticks that hath no one sound of Gods word patronizing or favouring it. Witnesse Mr. Br. who neither in his *Thesis*, nor in its Explication hath alledged one Scripture to make it good. Is *Pythagoras* come among us in a new body, speaking nothing but Parables and Paradoxes, which vulgar capacities can no more comprehend then they can *Plato's Ideas*, or *Democritus* his *Atomes*? If so, it shall be needfull for him to injoin upon his Scholiars (as he did of old) five years dumbnesse or silence: Else if the mouth of a very Asse should be open, it would rebuke the madnesse of the Prophet, for delivering things

so

ſo contradictive to the word, to himſelf, and to reaſon.

1 To the word and the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking by it, who every where oppoſeth Faith and works, as to Juſtification, making them to exclude not to infer or imply either the other. *By faith, therefore not* [at all] *by works: not by works, therefore by faith alone.* But this man puts them in a conjunction, makes Faith and works together the Condition of our juſtification, from thence to conclude that Faith is the onely Condition, and juſtifieth alone. So much a greater Artiſt is Mr. *Br.* then the Holy Ghoſt, and ſo ambitious of the praiſe of wiſedome that he thinks himſelf to be but a vulgar idiot, if his wiſdom be not ſtretched Nine whole words by meaſure, beyond and above the wiſedom of the Holy Ghoſt.

2 Contradictive to himſelf. For *Apb.* p. 300. *He denyeth that which he calleth an idle Concomitacny of works with Faith, that they onely ſtand by while Faith doth all, and concludes that they act together with faith in the ſame kind of cauſality to procure Juſtification*, and ſo denyeth that we are juſtified by Faith onely. Here contrariwiſe he denyeth all ſuch co-working of works with Faith, but *that faith may be ſaid to be the onely Condition, and to juſtifie onely.*

3 Contradictive to reaſon alſo, (and yet this next to [*Condition*] he ſeems to honour as the greateſt God) it muſt be to the Goats and ſheep of the mountains, not to Chriſts ſheep, to men that have reaſon, that Mr. *Br.* muſt deliver this doctrine, *That we are juſtified not by faith alone, but by works alſo, yet it ſtands nevertheles as a firm Maxim, faith is the onely condition, or juſtifieth alone.* If the lips were ſhut and ſealed up, yet reaſon would uſe a ventriloquy, or force a way thorow the ears to reclaim againſt ſuch an abſurdity. If I ſhould ſo reaſon of Condemnation the contrary to Juſtification, that when the blind lead the blind and both fall into the ditch, when ſeducers pervert thoſe that are made to be taken and deſtroyed, and ſo all utterly periſh and are damned: That tho all are damned, yet it is but the leader and ſeducer alone that is damned, he for all that he hath ſeduced, and they all but damned in him their principall and leader: Would not Mr. *Br.* be one of the firſt that would cry out at ſuch an Arguing, as abſurd and not Logicall.

Yet becauſe he is a man made up of the very ſpirits of Reaſon, and brings his Reaſons that his Aſſertion agrees with right reaſon according to the tenor of the Goſpel: I ſhall produce two or three inſtead of many Goſpel Scriptures, and lay by them his Reaſons

sons to see how pertinently they will agree as a Commentary with the Text. The Holy Ghost tells us, *Eph.* 2. 8, 9. *We are saved by Grace through faith, not of works lest any man should boast.* Mr. *Br.* Comments upon this Text thus, *i. e.* Principally by Faith least any man should boast principally [of himself.] But not of works principally to exclude this principall boasting, yet lesse principally of works also that man may also boast lesse principally [of himself.] Or thus, according to his second reason: Of Faith and not of works unreducible to Faith lest any should boast, yet of works also that by some relation or cognation are reducible to Faith, that of such works we might boast. Shall we call this a hatchet or a Comment upon the Text. Which of these Explications is the more absurd? Or as if in this latter that runs more smoothly then the former, we might not conclude so wisely of any morall vertue or duty: When we are said to be justified by any or all good qualifications and works, we are said to be justified by Mercy or Chastity or Wisdom onely, because all other vertues and works are reducible to this, by some one or other kind of relation or cognation.

Again, *Rom.* 4. 16. *It is of faith that it may be of grace*, the Antithesis whereof is given, *ver.* 4. *Not of works that it might not be of debt.* The Comment which Mr. *Brs* first reason gives to this Text is, Nay it is both of Faith and works, works are comprehended in Faith as the lesse principall in the principall: So that the meaning of the Text is, that it is principally of Faith, that it may be principally of Grace, but lesse principally of works that [at least] less principally it may be of debt also. His second reason thus Comments, It is of Faith, that is of Faith, and works reducible to Faith, that it may be of Grace, not of works unreducible to faith, (such as are murther, witchcraft, Sodomy, blasphemy, *&c.*) that it may not be of debt.

Again, *Tit.* 3. 5. *Not by works of righteousnesse which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us*, i. e. saith Mr. *Br.* Not principally by our works, but according to his mercy. Yet lesse principally by our works, and not according to his mercy. Or not by works of righteousnesse done by us that are not, but according to Gods mercy that is reducible to Faith. What else to make of it when he hath taught me, I may divulge. I might annex many Texts of the same nature, upon which these two reasons of his set as Comments, will speak out so much of sense, as the Commentator doth

doth in them of Conſcience. But I have fully both examined and anſwered before, all that is compriſed in this Theſis, where I took occaſion to weigh every branch thereof, under the notion of his ſecond Argument which he brings to prove Juſtification by works. To it I refer the reader for fuller ſatisfaction.

B. 2 *That he doth not derogate from faith, in yoking works with it in the joynt procurement of juſtification; becauſe he doth not aſcribe to works an equall part with it in this office or buſineſſe: but makes faith the more principall, and works but the leſſe principall part of the Condition: granting our firſt Juſtification to be chiefly by faith, and the ſecond Juſtification onely, by Obedience: and aſcribing the beginning or firſt point of Juſtification to faith alone, and but the continuance and conſummation thereof to works.* Aphor. Theſ. 74. & p. 302, 311, 312. And in many other parts of his Book.

All this hath been fully and oft anſwered before. Here onely I ſhall intreat the reader to retein in mind what hath been before pointed at.

1 That the Goſpel mentioneth not, knoweth not any ſuch diſtinction of a firſt and ſecond Juſtification by Chriſt, but ſpeaks onely of one juſtificatiou. That this doubling of Juſtifications is but a juggling fancy of the Papiſts by them firſt created, and by Mr. *Br.* licked into a finer mode and form, for the pillaring up of their Juſtification by works which hath no proppage from the word.

2 That according to Mr. *Brs* principles who caſeth both together in one kind of cauſality, it cannot be diſcerned how [otherwiſe then by bare and glozing words] any pre-eminence can be given ſo as duly to belong to Faith above and before works in this buſineſſe.

3 That even where and in what reſpects Mr. *Br.* gives a pre-eminence, it belongeth more properly to works then to Faith: Becauſe the conſummation and perfitting of Juſtification is ſo far more excellent then the beginning thereof, as that which is perfect, then that which is unperfect. And herein he equalizeth and in ſom phraſes ſeems to prefer works to Faith, in their operation to perfect what is begun.

4 That the Scripture affirms not onely the firſt but alſo the laſt point and period, the conſummation as well as the beginning of Juſtification to be by Faith. *By the Goſpel the righteouſneſſe of God* (*viz.* which he giveth us to Juſtification) *is revealed from Faith to Faith,*

Faith, saith the Apostle; he saith not from Faith to works, but from Faith to Faith, that is (omitting other Interpretations partly ridiculous, and partly invalid and besides the scope of the Apostle) from Faith inchoat to Faith growing and consummat, or coming neerer and neerer to consummation. This Exposition the choicest of our Divines give, as both properly agreeing with the drift of the Text, and as owned and patronized by the like phrase in other Scriptures: *From strength to strength*, Psal. 88. 7. *From glory to glory*, 2 Cor. 3. 18. which even all acknowledge to be understood, from one to another, from a lesser to a greater degree of strength and glory. So also of this phrase, *from faith to faith*. And thus not onely the beginning but also the increase and consummation of Gospel Justification in our own Consciences before God, is here attributed to Faith, which as it groweth to more and more strength, by apprehending more and more revelations of the Gospel; so it more and more declareth and evidenceth to the soul the certainty of our Justification, to the continuall stablishment and increase of our peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. And thus the *Magis* and *Minus* is in us not in God; and whatsoever of increase there is, is from Faith not from works. Nay the same Apostle tels us it is a most unglorious task which this uncomparably wise and profound man undertakes, *viz.* to teach them that are wise to salvation to become fools thereunto. *Are yee so foolish?* saith he, *having begun in the Spirit, are yee now made perfect by the Flesh?* That by the Spirit and the Flesh is to be understood Faith and works in order to Justification, cannot, will not be denyed. When therefore Mr. *B.* teacheth men to seek the beginning of Justification by faith, and the perfecting thereof not by Faith onely but by works also, he teacheth them to be foolish [*O foolish*] the worst fools to salvation, and to be wise onely to condemnation. This is to be wise according to Mr. *B.* wisedom in this Tractate, that is wise after the Flesh not after the Spirit, in seeking happiness in the way of works which the wisedom of the Flesh teacheth, not in the way of Faith wch the wisdom of the Spirit, the wisedom of Christ & his Gospel revealeth. But all this, together with a plain and full discovery of the vanity of this evasion, hath been in its due place before held out, which would be but a tyring of the Reader here again to be troubled with.

Onely the generall and chief thing which Mr. Br. both here and elsewhere layeth as a foundation to his Justification by works,

It shall not be amisse briefly to examine here, for the prevention of deceit to his Reader, before I put a totall conclusion and period to what I have thought fit to except against this Work of his. If it prove sandy and unsound, his great *Colossus* of Justification by works, falls all to shivers. This is his quaint interpretation of [*faith*] in all such Scriptures as ascribe to Faith (in opposition to works) our justification. That then by it we are to understand all Gospel duties, all that Christ Commandeth; not Faith in a distinct consideration from other qualifications and duties, but Faith in a collective sense, comprizing all morall duties and actions within it, which is Faith and all its fruits, yea more, Faith and all that is reducible to it. And thus according to Mr. *Br.* so oft as we are said to be justified by Faith not by works, we must understand that the Holy Ghost meaneth, that we are justified by Faith and works done after the tenor of the Gospel, not by Faith and works done after the tenor of the Law. Behold now the unsathomed depth of Mr. *Brs* wit, and the unlimitted verge of his power. His wit surpassing all the wisedom of all good and Orthodox men and Angels; of whom no one had ever the reach since the world began, to find with all his searching such a bugbear sense lurking in the plain Scripture Texts of the Apostle: His power, that with the stroking of this *Mercuriall rod*, he makes fire and water, life and death, hell and heaven, to lay down all their enmity each to other, and sweetly to coll lodge and incorporate together. Who would have thought that *Paul* who so seriously and sacredly professeth *that he had rather in the Church to speak five words with his understanding so that he might teach and edifie others also, than ten thousand in an* [*unknown*] *Tongue*, 1 Cor. 14. 17, 19. And in preaching the Gospel *discended to the unlearned and babes to feed them with milke, to make all plain and easie to their understandings*, 1 Cor. 3. 2. should yet every where deliver the chief doctrine of the Gospel [Justification by Christ] in so dark Parables and riddles, that none could find it out, untill this *Oedipus* inspired from *Socinus* and *Arminius*, rose up to unriddle him? For let there be named any one Protestant in any age (till Mr. Br. held out his Candle to give light to the Sun) that ever could dream of this Allegoricall sense, after the principles of *Origen*, lurking in *Pauls* words? Or what hinders now but Faith may be turned into works and works into Faith, Grace into strict justice and strict justice into free Grace, the Law into Gospel and the Gospel into meer Law; since Mr. Br. hath made a reconciliation

conciliation and composure between Faith and Works in the point of Justification.

But whether this interpretation of Mr. *B.* be so firm as it is pretty and witty, hath been before examined, as elswhere, so in the Examination of his third Argument for Justification by works, drawn from his large definition of Faith which he giveth in his *Thesis* 70. Here onely I shall mention some phrases or names by which Justifying Faith is described in Scriptures, and leave it to the judgment of every intelligent Reader, to determine whether works can properly or in any tolerable sense be said to be comprized in faith as acting in the same kind of causality about such acts as those phrases or names imply.

1 As Mr. Br. himself in his shorter definition defineth faith, it is called our *Receiving of Christ*, Jo. 1. 12. and that not in that wide sense which Mr. *Br.* fancieth, but in that strict sense wherein *Paul* interprets it, *viz.* the receiving of Christ *to be our Righteousnes, or receiving abundance of Grace and of the gift of righteousnes by him*, Rom. 5. 16.

2 It is called the *directing of the eye, or looking to Christ yea to Christ lifted up* [upon the Cross] *for healing. Io.* 3. 14.

3 *A coming to Christ for Life*, Jo. 6. 37. & 5. 40.

4 *The eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood to everlasting life*, Jo. 6. 53—56.

5 *A putting on of Christ* [as a Garment of Righteousnes] *to cover our nakednesse and filthinesse*, Phil. 3. 9. Rev. 3. 18. I could add many the like phrases if it were needfull. But these may suffice; and who is there that sees not these to imply an instrumentality in faith to make Christ ours to Justification? Yea and that in faith onely and not in works at all? for how can Charity, Chastity, Mercy, righteousnesse, and the severall acts of these and other qualifications, of which most have our Neighbour or Brother for their immediate Object, about which in acting they are occupant; be called the receiving, intuition of, and coming to Christ? the eating of his flesh and drinking his blood, or the putting on of him for righteousnesse? It would seem strange to me that any man waking and not dreaming should conclude such works to be Antecedents, and not the fruits of Justification and life by Christ. Or that when faith is described by these denominating phrases, works also as couched in faith, should contrary to their nature be so de-

nominated. Nay Faith is thus diverſly named in oppoſition to works, yea to Goſpel works. For ſo doth our Saviour anſwer and determine the queſtion put to him, what to do [under the Goſpel] that we might work the works of God? *i. e.* what is to be done on our part that we may be juſtified and ſaved? *This is the work of God* (ſaith he) [that is, this is in ſtead of all doings all workings] *that ye beleeve in him whom he hath ſent*, Jo. 6. 28, 29. which after he expreſſeth more fully to be a beleeving in him that came down from heaven, and that gave, and as he gave his life for the world, and giveth life to the world. All works are excluded that this beleeving might be reſerved, ſole, entire, ſacred, and ſoveraign to receive Chriſt to Juſtification and ſalvation.

Here at length I ſhall put a period to my Examination of this Tractate of Mr. *Br.* in which I have not wittingly let paſſe any one particle of all that he hath brought to the re-erecting of Juſtification by works, without examining the ſtrength and force of it, wch if he had done in relation to all the Arguments which the Proteſtant Churches and Divines have brought againſt it, before he adventured peremptorily to pronounce their doctrine Hetorodox and Antinomiſtick, and the doctrine of the Papiſts in this point ſound and holy; I am of opinion that either this work of his had never come forth to the ſubverting of ſouls and troubling of the Church, or if it had ſo come forth, it would have been a very abomination to all that are not made to be taken, and trampled under foot as an accurſed thing. But now having begun in that manner as we ſee, to ſet up this worſt piece of damning Popery, under a falſe pretence of love to the Proteſtant, and hatred of the Popiſh Religion. It is not to be expected but that ſeeing his reputation jeoparded, he will *per fas & nefas*, proceed to ſeek the ſupport of it, though it be to the further ecclipſing of the Grace of God and honour of Chriſt.

CHAP.

Chap. XXV.

The Conclusion of the whole Treatise, demonstrating that although we with the Scriptures exclude works from Justification, yet we include them as necessary to a Christian life, and that no less seriously, and upon more spirituall grounds, than the Evill Workers that will be justified by them.

HAving ended (at present) with Mr. *Baxter*, I have for the Conclusion of all, somewhat to say that may have relation to the weak reader. It is a difficult thing to remove works from justification, and not to expose our selves therein to the Censure of babish, ungospellized, and unstablished men, that we therein banish them also from the life and practice of a Christian. When we teach that *the righteousness of the Gospel is revealed from Faith to Faith: as it is written, the just shall live by Faith*, [not by works:] *Rom.* 1. 17. And that *no man is justified by the Law*, i. e. by the strictest observation of the righteousness of the Law, *Because it is written, that the just shall live by Faith*, Gal. 3. 11. *That the inheritance is by Faith, not by works, lest any man should boast*, Rom. 4. 1, 2. Eph. 2. 8, 9. *That it is of Faith that it may be of Grace: and if it be of grace, then is it no more of works, else grace were no more Grace; But if it be of works, then is it no more of grace, otherwise works were no more works*, Rom. 4. 16. & 11. 6. *That whosoever seeketh justification and blessedness by works, worketh himself out of it*, and shall never attaine it, because *they sought it not by Faith, but as it were by the works of the Law*, Rom. 9. 31, 32. At the sound of this doctrine the unspiritual man excepteth, and flesh and bloud swelleth murmuringly Crying out, What profit is it then to serve the Lord? Why should I fast, pray, give alms, shew mercy, study holines and purity, deny my self the pleasures of sinn, any more, when all these have no efficacy in them to justifie and save? It was the Clamor of men against *Paul*, when he preached the riches of grace abounding the more, by the abounding of Mans sinns: *We will therefore sinn* (said they) *that Grace may abound*, Rom. 6. 1. *And do evill that good may come*, Rom 3. 8. This doctrine of *Faith makes voyd the Law*, loosing us from all obligation to perform the holines and righteousness which the Law requireth, *Rom.* 3. 31. And (as Mr. Br. teacheth them further to reply against God) tendeth to drive obedience out of the world. For if it be denyed that man can merit

merit happiness by his own righteousness, he will cease to be righteous and take the bitt in his teeth to run rebell. So deep an impression hath the Covenant of works yet still in mans heart, that though he be insufficient *to do or to think as he ought*, 2 Cor. 3. 5. yet he will have [*Do and Live*] to be the issue of *Life and Death* still. And Mr. Br. teacheth them to stopp the hole of mans insufficiency with this nayl (not of the Sanctuary but of *Alexander* the Copper-Smith) because we cannot perform legall therefore Gospel-obedience shall do the work, (as if work were not work, when the Title of Gospel is written on it) and because we cannot fullfill perfect, therefore sincere obedience shall serve the Turn.

Hence is it that the Popish and Arminian doctrines wherewith this Book of Mr. Br. is fully fraughted, takes every where so plausibly with, and hath such Compleat acceptance among the multitude both of the learned and unlearned. It is a doctrine not above but agreeing with the principles of Nature and the naturall man: even the naturall Conscience suggesteth it to the unlearned, to seek for happiness by their own righteousness. And both that and the precepts of Moral Philosophy also, together with the Law of *Moses*, instruct the learned to seek for the *Summum Bonum*, the best felicity, all felicity in the way of vertue and vertuous performances. Here now when any comes to them in the name of Christ, holding forth to them the same doctrine, it kindles in them so swiftly as fire in towe, no need of the teaching of God, or renewing of the Spirit; Flesh and bloud of it self gives its suffrage to it. An easie task have these teachers to perswade men and draw disciples after them, and set them in an activeness and dexterity of practicing what they teach. It is easily learned to swimm swiftly with the stream, and to drop the Bowle down the hill. But to teach men to live by Faith, and yet to be fruitfull in good works too: Not to seek justification and life by their righteousness, yet to be zealous of all righteousnes and good works continually; *hic labor hoc opus est*. It is above the principles of Nature to apprehend it. He must swimm against the stream, and roll the Bowl against the Hill, walk after the Spirit and not after the Flesh, that puts it effectually into practice.

Yet that our Doctrine doth not let loose the reins to the flesh, nor (howsoever carnall sensuallists may abuse it to their Condemnation) in the least degree blunt the spirits of the spirituall man to well-doing, nor deny the both expediency and necessity of all good works in the life of a Christian, is evident. 1 Because although we

we exclude morall qualifications and works from officiating to Justification, yet we retein and include them in and unto sanctification. Our doctrine with Christs and his Apostles, holds forth the Lord Jesus to every soul to be received both as a justifier and sanctifier; declareth him to have descended from heaven both to justifie the ungodly, and to sanctifie the justified. That he is made unto us of God, not onely *Righteousness*, but *Sanctification* also: To justifie us by an imputed and sanctifie us by an inherent righteousness: The one by the effusion of his bloud, the other by the infusion of his Spirit. That his office is not onely to satisfie justice for us that we may live, but also to new principle and create us, that we may live to God. Not onely to redeem us from all iniquity, but withall to purifie us [into] a peculiar people, zealous of good works. In whom both these works are not in good measure, neither of them is in any measure, effectually accomplished. That sanctification is the purchase of Christs bloud, but the immediate effect of his Spirit; merited by his death, but Conferred and Communicated by his life as all power both in heaven and in earth is given into his hand, and *whe is ascended on high to give gifts to men.* That both imputed and inherent righteousnes as termined and actually existent in and upon man, proceed from his union unto Christ. That Sanctification is as great and glorious a work as Justification, and our real as our relative holiness and righteousness: Neither could it be discerned so clearly how we were quickened [in Law] & raised from the dead, who were dead in sinne and trespasses, and so passed from death to life, from Condemnation to salvation, by the forgiveness of sinn; were we not also quickened & raised up from under the death and bondage of sinn, no more to serve sinn, but as alive from the dead, had our fruit [and living motions] to practicall holines and righteousnes. That as well our sanctification as our Justification, is in Christ, and both from him derivable to us by Faith in him. That Faith is qualified by God to apprehend Christ both to purifie us by his bloud, and to sanctifie us by his Spirit, and so becomes instrumentall both to Justification and sanctification, yet by a twofold Act; as the Condemned Traytor extends one and the same hand to receive from his gracious Prince a pardon of his Treason, and a Commission to be his vice-gerent in some Noble and magnificent office therein to serve his Prince, promote the welfare of his Country, and make his own name and person famous and precious in the eyes of all men, among whom his present vertuous behaviour

and

and Noble atchievements may wipe off and bring to oblivion the ſtain of his former delinquency. That one (and the ſame a chief) end of our Juſtification by Chriſt is our ſanctification & the fruits thereof, here inchoat and increaſing, hereafter Conſummate and perfected. *Therefore are we delivered out of the hands of our enemies, that we may ſerve him without Fear in holineſs and righteouſneſs*, Luk. 1. 74, 75. *Therefore are we dead to and delivered from the Law, by the body of Chriſt, that we ſhould be married to another, even to him that is raiſed from the dead, that we might bring forth fruit to God, and ſerve not in the oldneſs of the letter, but in the Newneſs of the Spirit*, Rom. 7. 4, 6. *Chriſt hath made us Kings and Prieſts, or a Royall Prieſthood unto God, to offer up living ſacrifices acceptable to God through him*, 1 Pet. 2. 5, 9. Rev. 1. 6. To our inſtalment therein are pre-required, the ſanctification of Conſecration, and the ſanctification of habitual righteouſneſs and holineſs infuſed into us and ſet in actual operation in us. The former of theſe is done chiefly by the ſacrificed bloud of Chriſt ſprinkled upon the Conſcience, and the ſacred veſtiments of his Righteouſneſs put on by Faith (as was typified primarily of Chriſt the High Prieſt, and ſecondarily of the Prieſthood of Saints under the kingdome of Chriſt, by the Conſecration of *Aaron* and his ſonns, with the bloud of the Altar ſprinkled on them, and the putting on of holy veſtiments upon them, their own being Caſt off, *Lev* 8.) The latter Chiefly by the Spirit of Chriſt, inlivening enabling and acting them to the work and worſhip for which they are Conſecrated (and I know not but this may be alſo figured in the ordination of the Prieſts under the Law, by the Anoynting oyl in the ſame Chapter mentioned and uſed.) That differs but little from Juſtification as termined to this its end: This differs not at all from ſanctification when it is taken in the ſenſe wherein the ſcriptures often, and our Divines ſtill uſe it, (when they diſtinguiſh between Juſtification and ſanctification) *viz.* in its active ſenſe, the inſpiration of the habits of holineſs and righteouſneſs, in its paſſive ſenſe, the ſame habits inſpired into the ſoul. Whoſoever wanteth either of theſe prerequiſits to this ſacred office, we grant him to be but a titular Prieſt, a Mock-Saint. For without Conſecration to offer as a Prieſt ſpeaks him an uſurper: And to profeſs Prieſt and not to offer ſpeaks him a rebell and revolter. We own no ſanctification by the Spirit of Chriſt, which hath not Juſtification by his bloud, in order going before it, nor any Juſtification or forgiveneſs by the death of Chriſt, which hath not ſanctification by his Spirit, in order of nature following it.

Thus

Thus we do not (as the Papists and Mr. Br. learning from the Papists object calumniously) exclude works from the life of a Christian; but assert them to be necessary to a Christian life: so necessary, that without them whosoever is Capable of working, is no Christian. Though we exclude them from Justification, yet we include them in sanctification, their habits as parts in the whole, their acts or themselves acted, as fruits thereof. Nay we do not deny in a good sense some kind of Causality which they have to sanctifie, that is, to the increase of sanctification. *To him that hath, it shall be given, and he shall have more abundantly. Well done good and faithfull servant, thou hast been faithfull in a little, I will make thee Ruler over much, &c.* saith our Saviour; *Ask and ye shall have, seek and ye shall finde, knock and it shall be opened to you. The ground or earth which drinketh in the Rain which cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs [or fruit, &c.] is neer to a blessing. But that which bringeth forth bryars and thorns is rejected and neer to cursing,* &c. *Heb.* 6. 7, 8. with many other the like Testimonies of Scripture, which it would be superfluous here to recite. How then do we in the least measure blunt the edge of mens affections to good works, by teaching that they do not justifie, when we affirm them necessary to sanctification? If Mr. *Br.* should affirm that Bread and Wine and other Creatures appropriated to mans nutriment, are not ordeined of God to Clothe him, or that his garments are not ordeined of God to Feed him; doth he therein minister to me just Cause to exclaym against him, that he fights against natural reason, perswading men never more to eat, because their meat is not appointed to Clothe them? or to walk naked because he saith, their garments are not usefull to nourish them? No more Cause hath Mr. *Br.* or the Papists to accuse us that we banish good works from the life of a Christian, by teaching that they are not usefull or appropriated to justifie, but to sanctifie very usefull in all the particulars before-mentioned. How unacquainted with the frame of a Christian spirit are these objectors? Either they do not experimentally know, or else do stifle within themselves this knowledge, that a Christ-enjoying and Gospellized soul gaspeth no less for deliverance from the bondage, than from the Condemnation of sinn: delights so much in performing duty to Christ, as in receiving pardon from him; groanes so pathetically under the body as ever he did under the guilt of sinn: Cryeth with equall vehemency of affection for holiness unto God as for happiness with him; for Conformity to him in righteousness

as in glory: makes no other use of his redemption, than to run at liberty the race of obedience set before him: embraceth and delighteth in sanctifying as well as in saving grace, in the infusion as in the imputation of righteousnes: labours to dispense all for the Lord and his service, whatsoever he hath received from the Lord and his free grace. Therefore whatsoever the Lord powrs upon him to sanctification is received with so great joy in the Holy Ghost as that which is communicated to him to justification: and he labours to be and express himself wholly Christs, as well as to obtein Christ wholly his. As for Mr. *Brs* meerly Morall Men that will receive Christ neither to Justification nor to sanctification, but upon their own terms, purchasing him by Fine and rent, that the glory might be partly theirs and not wholly Christs; It is enough that Mr. *Br.* hardens and subverts them in this their Moral madnes wholly contradictive to the spiritualnes and witdome of the Gospel. We shall not be insnared by all the nicities of his Arts and Chimicall extracts of the spirits of his spoyling Philosophy, to involve our selves with him in the guilt of poysoning so many souls, and turning their best righteousnes and devotion into sinn, by encouraging them to appropriate the same to such an end as is destructive to the glory of Gods grace, and contrary to the minde and rule of the Gospel. We have one Master which is Christ, his dictates expressed by him and his Apostles in the plainnes and foolishnes of their preaching are so sacred and authoritative with us, that neither the most labyrinthical mazes of sophistry shall unwinde us, nor the extravagancies of the most luxuriating witts, nor the most Curious plausibilities of humane reason shall (by Gods Grace) unreason us so from our selves, as to undisciple us from him. Yea though we could not in some things give a satisfactory answer to the sophisticated reasonings of these disputers against Christ and his Gospel, yet should we sit down as fools with Christ and his Apostles adoring the manifold wisdome of God revealed in a mystery, rather than be wise with these men to the world; knowing that the foolishnes of God is wiser, and the weakness of God is stronger than men: And we seek wisdome and happines from the mines of Christs Gospel, not from the dry quarrie of mans literature and inventions.

2 Though we reject it as an arrogant and presumptuous doctrine, which Mr. *Br.* in Common with the Papists teacheth, [That we are justified and saved by our good qualifications and works for

for our works, for the merit and worthinesse of our good works] yet we teach and believe that they are (in respect of all that have age, ability, and time to perform them) necessary Consequents of our Justification and Antecedents of our glorification. Let a man pretend what he will of Faith in Christ; yet if by Faith hee do not cleave firmly to him, to derive from him power to mortifie every sinn, to perform all duty: if he can allow within himselfe any known evill, or continue in the neglect of any known duty, without striving to get the victory in the strength of Christs Spirit, over every such infirmity: wee take such a man so farr from Christ, as Christ is from *Belial*, A branch in Christ not bearing fruit, which is appointed to be cut off and cast into the fire, because he was never in Christ otherwise but by a formall profession, never had vitall union to him, or communion with him, by the ligatures of Faith and the Spirit. For sanctification is an individual companion of Justification: And the office of Christ is to be the Author of both to all that believe. Otherwise the work of his Mediator-ship should not be compleated in either one of these, and so he should not be our Christ if a halfe Christ only to us. And Sanctification is still begun and carried on towards perfection also (where there is time and meanes) in the kingdom of Grace, before its perfecting and swallowing up into glory, in the Kingdom of glory. No righteousnes and holines of man is begun in the next life: But there shall be the consummation in power, of that which here was begun in truth, though it laboured of, and languished with much infirmity.

3 Wee are guiltles of those Crimes wherewith Mr. *Br.* endeavours to defame us and our Doctrine. For 1. Neither doe wee teach or think (as M. *Br.* suggesteth) that nothing is preaching Christ, but preaching him as a pardoning justifying Saviour? *Apb.* pa. 328. Indeed we preach Justification to consist, if not only, yet chiefly in the pardon of sinn through the mediation of Christs death. That this benefit of Christ is perfected by the satisfaction which he hath made to Gods justice in suffering for us, and appropriated to us by faith alone. But wee deny this to be all the Gospel-grace exhibited to us by Christ, and in and through him. We hold him forth as the Light of the world also, having all the treasures of wisedom and knowledg hid in him, *Joh.* 8. 12. *Col.* 2. 3. from whom are all the irradiations and Revelations of all the my-

ſteries of Grace effectuall to life and holineſs, *Mat.* 13. 11. 1 *Cor.* 2. 10. And to the word and ſpirit of Chriſt we ſend all men for illumination. And the Life of the world, not only to reſtore them to life in law, by Juſtification, but as the Lord and principle of Life, to beget in us an inherent life active and moving to all obedience. Therefore we endeavour to ſend all *to Chriſt for life, even for this life*, becauſe *the whole judgment and diſpenſation thereof is committed to him, and he is our all* [*to ſanctification alſo.*] Joh. 5. 21, 22, 25, 26. Col. 3. 11. We indeed except againſt that Doctrine as more Legal than Evangelical, that roars & thunders Condemnation againſt poor Exiles in a dry wilderneſs, where is no water, fainting and even dead with thirſt, if they do not ariſe, work, and fulfill their task: We require firſt, that the Rock be cloven with the Rod of God, that the water of life may guſh out in full Rivers, and that the fainting ſouls be brought to drink thereof, and then called upon in the life and ſtrength which they have hence received, to work and be doing. Yea to come to this ſtream often to drink, that their ſtrength and ſpirits may be daily more revived, that they may become daily more enabled for, and more abundant in the work of the Lord. We have not with Mr. Br. yet learned the skill of preaching good works to make Chriſt ours, but follow the rule of the Scriptures, to preach Chriſt into the hearts of men, to make them fruitfull in good works. Neither doe wee count all formall obedience and righteouſneſſe of men, though conſcientiouſly, and by the guidance of Naturall Conſcience, performed to be either ſanctification, or the fruit thereof.

That onely is ſanctification which flowes from the heart of Chriſt, and is infuſed by the Spirit of Chriſt. For the attainment thereof we call all men into union and fellowſhip with Chriſt; ſo far are we from holding that *Nothing is preaching Chriſt, but the preaching him as Juſtifier and Saviour, that we hold it an empty* Preachment that preacheth any good thing without Chriſt, or out of Chriſt, of which men are not taught to make Chriſt the *Alpha* and the *Omega*. We leave it to *Mr.* Br. and his brethren to urge works, duties, obedience, &c. and once in a Moon, upon an auſpicious Tropick thereof, to remember Chriſt and grace, and tell us that all muſt be done by the help of grace, and without Chriſt we can do nothing: Yet leaving us uncertain ſtill, whether it be the Grace and Chriſt of *Pelagius*, or elſe of God reconciled to us, that hee

he speaketh. I should be too long in expressing fully how we hold forth Christ, whole Christ, and only Christ, to Adoption, protection, perseverance, strengthening, comforting, perfecting, &c. In a word, to all that is either good to be received, or good to be done. In him wee teach that God will have all his fresh springs to reside, that without him we are nothing, can do nothing; that in him and by him we have all, and can do all things. That therefore we preach nothing but Christ, yet preach all that is to be preached in preaching him, because *in him it pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell*, Col. 1. 19. even all fulness for us: so that in him we are full, out of him meer emptiness. We would not have one beam of this Sun of Righteousness clouded, but labour to discover to our people his full glory and Soveraignty to all those sacred ends to which God hath consecrated him, that if any would have nothing of Christ to be preached but his pardoning and saving, the sin may be wholly theirs, not ours, that they will receive the skirt of Christ, and consequently refuse Christ, when we preach to them whole Christ, and all the benefits that are by him.

Nor 2 do we deny an ordinate and subordinate love to our selves (as Mr. *Br.* slanders us no lesse bitingly than secretly, *App. pa.* 81, 82.) in teaching that it is the most Gospel-frame of Spirit to perform duty out of meer love to God, without seeking by such duties wrought [*quasi opere operato*] remission of sins, redemption from Hell, and right to glory by the Merit thereof, (as he teacheth us to do, thinking no doubt, his glory shall be great, if he can there perswade where all the subtlest sons of Satan, the Jesuits have not been able.) Nay we maintayn that none can regularly love himself who loveth not God above himself, and seeks not Gods glory more than his own good. That whosoever in a pretext of love to himself brings his fardle of trashie works at the feet of Christ, by them to purchase to himself the benefits of his death, is of all men the worst enemie to himself, incurs rejection and expulsion from Christ and all the benefits of his death and resurrection. For hee was *sent to seeke onely that which was lost, came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.* He loves himself indeed, and spiritually, that for his love to God denies himself. The self-dejected Publican is accepted with God, when the prating Pharisee is hurled with his mouth full of works out at the door. Or is there any great difference between this and the Devils doctrine preached to our first Parents?

Parents? *Ye shall be as Gods*, said the Devill; Ye shall be all *Christs*, *Saviours*, *Justifiers*, saith Mr. *Br.* Your righteousnes and Christs righteousnes shall jump together into the same kind of Causality to justifie and save you. Our first Parents hearkned, and seeking to become Gods, became Devils, or (what is worse) slaves to the Devill. We have all felt the smart, yet many, and that of them which are termed Angels, listen earnestly to the like hissing of the Serpent now again. We can but mourn for them, that in madd love to themselves will hasten up to heaven, by climbing high Steeples, that look fairly thither-ward, but can never heave them up to it, nay contrariwise can give them no such sustentation, but that they fall thence, and dash themselves into shivers. Yet in our doctrine is contained a wise and ordinate love to our selves: Though we use not works as waxen wings to soar aloft to kisse the Sun, and settle our selves in the same Sphere with him, yet wee make use of our qualifications and duties to the continuall encrease of our sanctification: and to what greater good for himself can mans strongest love to himself aspire, than to his full and real perfection, consisting in his restitution to Gods image, and conformity to his will and nature? This shall be the Consummate blessednes which we shall enjoy above, and it is a blessednes inchoate and increasing, while we passe from strength to strength in it here. Who are the self-haters and self-destroyers, the Papists or we, the success will at length evidence, and such professed Divines and Christians among us, as have not their eyes soyled with *Kederminster* dust and smoak, can discern already.

Nor thirdly, doth our doctrine tend to drive obedience out of the world: So that we may answer Mr. *Brs* question, *Aphor.* p. 325. [*If men once beleeve that works are not so much as a part of the Condition of our Justification, will it not much tend to relax their diligence?*] with the authority of the Apostle, who having taught his Ephesians that *we are saved by grace through faith, not of works lest any man should boast*, Eph. 2. 8, 9. Yet concludeth, that as many *as have learned Christ truly, and heard him, and have been taught by him as the truth is in Jesus: These all have learned to put off concerning the former conversation, the old Man which is corrupt*, &c. *and to be renewed in the spirit of the mind, and to put on the New Man, which after God is created in righteousnes and true holines*, Eph. 4. 20---24. If Mr. *Br.* had been taught of God as the truth is in Jesus, I should think he would not have put, at least

left upon deliberation lest in print such a question and bold Cavill against the Apostle, yea against Christ himself.

Object. But if good works will neither justifie nor save me, why should I do them, and not take the liberty to do what I list?

Answ. The voyce of a Rebel against God, who if hee may not serve God to his own ends, will not serve him at all, and professeth openly that he doth all that he doth in Gods work, not for Gods sake, but for his own sake. An Objection more deserving to be answered with a Thunder-bolt, than with Scripture-reason. Yet may there be alledged many other most holy and honourable ends for which we are to do good works, though we be not justified and saved by them. These I had thought here to have particularized, but the work is swoln already to a bignes and dimension never intended at first. And this Task hath been already so fully performed by so many of our Protestant Writers in answer to the Papists, that I should but glean after them to say a little, but begin a new work, if I should say all that they have sayd, and might be said to this purpose. I therefore transmit the Reader for his full satisfaction to read *Calv.* Instit. *lib.* 3. *Cap.* 16. *Zanch. Confess. Fidei pro se & sua Familia*, bound with his *Miscellan Ursin. Catech. Quest* 91. *Catech.* and his *Quest.* 5. upon that Question. *Tylenus Synt. part* 2. *disp.* 46. *Th.* 8, 9, 10, 11. where is to be read too short an abbreviation of the three former. But M. *Perkins* in one of his works I remember (though at present I am bereaved of them all) hath the very same words of *Zanchy* translated into *English* in answer to this question. And since these, whole hundreds both of English and forreign Divines, have after *Zanchy* and *Perkins* delivered the same things in substance with them, though some more largely, some more compendiously, so that to the exercised Reader it will be superfluous for me to write any thing upon the same subject.

I shall conclude all in the words of *Augustine*, as more needing his Apology than himself, where he useth it. *Lib. de Spir. & Litera.* Cap. 35. *Hæc egi libro isto loquacius fortasse quàm sat est: Sed contra inimicos Gratia Dei parcùm mihi dixisse videor. Nihil que mihi tam multum dicere delectat, quam ubi mihi & Scriptura ejus plurimum suffragatur, & id agitur, ut qui gloriatur, in Domomino glorietur, & in omnibus gratias agamus, Domino Deo nostro sursum corda habentes; unde a patre luminum omne Datum optimum, & omne donum perfectum est*; that is, These things have I treated of in this Book, it may be with more than enough

nough plenty of words and language : But I ſeem to my ſelfe to have ſpoken little againſt the Enemies of the grace of God. And I take delight to be large in ſpeaking about nothing elſe ſo much, as when both the Scripture doth moſt give its teſtimony with me, and the queſtion treated on is, that hee which glorieth may glory in the Lord, and that in all things we may give thanks to God, having our hearts lifted up to the Father of Lights from whom every good and every perfect gift diſcendeth.

He it is that freely juſtifieth us by his Grace, To him be the praiſe and glory of all, and let his Kingdom come, and be ſpeedily inlarged throughout the world, that from all parts thereof there may be a joyfull acclamation of Saints, *Amen, Amen.*

FINIS.

A

TABLE of the Generall and Chief Heads of Doctrine Treated of in this *Booke*.

A

WHether the To credere or Act of beleeving be that by which we are justified, part 1. p. 164. and onward to p. 181. & p. 363, 364.

Mr. Br. to shew that both Papists and Arminians are met together in his owne breast, teacheth both that it is our justifying Righteousnesse, and imputed to us for Righteousnesse, his Reasons to prove it examined, ibid. p. 166, &c.

More of Act, viz. Immanent and Life.

A short Animadversion upon *Mr.* Brs dispute of Christs Active and passive righteousnesse, in order to Justification, Part 1. p. 21. to 25.

Afflictions befalling the Saints, not parts of the Curse, but fruits of Gods Love, Part 1. p. 35. to 37.

What they are in their nature, ib. p. 44, 45

Antinomians, their first rise, originall, and what their Tenets then were, part 1. p. 263, 264. Their growth, and what hath been in these latter yeers charged on them as errours, ib. 264, —266.

What of all wherewith they have been charged is errour indeed, ibid. p. 267. to 271. & 273. Who are such in Mr. Brs Kalender, Pref. p. 7, 8. part 1. p. 271, 272. His Fraud under this Nick-name to make odious the Gospel and all true Protestants, Pref. ibid. part 1. p 274.

In the midst of his Invectives against imaginary, he hath more then all men besides, honoured the reall Antinomians, part 1. p. 162, 163. and declared himself really one of them, p. 277.

Exotick Arts how far usefull in Divinity, Pref. p. 14. to the 17.

They are incompetent to be Rules and Judges, in purely Gospel matters, ibid. and in some following pages, and part 1. p. 341.

What evils have followed such use and abuse of it, Pref. 24, &c.

How abasingly the Scriptures speak of it as so abused, Pref. p. 22, 23.

More viz. Sophistry.

Authority of men viz. Faith.

B

Bellarmine and *Mr.* Br. speak the same things in the point of Justification, part 2. p. 25. & 31.

Bullingers judgment of mingling prophane Arts (in teaching) with the Gospel, pref. p. 42, 43.

C

Mr. Brs new Modell of the Causes of

Juſtification and Salvation examined, part 1. p. 314, &c.

And 1 *of the principall efficient* Cauſe, ib. p. 316, 317. 2 *Of the inſtrumentall* Cauſe, ib. p. 317, 318. 3 *Of the procatarctick* Cauſes, ib. p. 318. *to* 321. 4 *Of the naturall* Cauſe, *and the Proteſtant doctrine defended againſt his cavils*, ib. p. 323. to 327. 5 *Likewiſe of the formall* Cauſe, ib. p. 327. 329.

The Proteſtant doctrine that Faith is the Inſtrument or Inſtrumentall Cauſe *of Juſtification*, viz. *Gods effective and mans receptive Inſtrument, largely defended againſt Mr.* Brs *Sophiſms*, ib. p. 330. to 348.

Whether Faith be the Cauſa ſine qua non, *ib.* p. 356, 357.

Works cannot be the cauſa ſine qua non, *part* 2. p. 110, 111.

Charity *the Rule of judging one another, and by what evidence it muſt judge*, part 2. p. 93, 94.

What it is to take half and what to take whole Chriſt *to juſtification*, part 2. p. 184, 186. *What to make* Chriſt *our All in Preaching*, part 2. p. 291.

More, viz. Grace. ——293.

Whether Juſtification run upon Conditions, *or elſe be free and abſolute, and in what ſenſe it may be granted to be* Conditional, pa. 1. p. 108. to 118.

The numerouſneſſe and withall unprofitableneſſe of the Conditions *which Mr.* Br. *aſſigneth*, part 2. p. 31, 32. *His vain aſcribing to* Conditions, part 2. p. 26, 83, 108, 109, &c. 272, 273. *His Reaſons to prove it examined*, part 1. p. 353, to 356.

His diſpute to prove it ſtill after we are in Chriſt to remain Conditional, par. 1. p. 292. to 308. *What the judgment of the Proteſtant Divines in this point is*, part 2. p. 17 to 22. & 204, 205. *The promulgation & offer of it may be granted* Conditionall, *but once in being and poſſeſſion it is abſolute*, part 1. p. 355, 356.

The hurtfullneſs of the contrary doctrine which Mr. Br *maintaineth*, part 1. p. 351—353.

The raſhneſſe of ſome Miniſters in cloſing with Mr. Br. *in this his Popiſh Arminian doctrine*, pa. 2. p. 22, 23, 25, 237.

Whether the Covenant *of Grace were originally made between the Father and the Son, and what the* Covenant *was, and upon what terms ſo made*, p. 1. p. 99. to 107.

What relation all the other Covenants *made in time between God and man, had to this*, ibid.

Mr Br. *after the Papiſts diſtinguiſheth between the* Commands *and* Counſels *of the word*, part 1. p. 213, 214.

*The doctrine of Juſtification by Faith alone, not a ſoul-*Cozening *doctrine*, p. 2. p. 173, &c.

Beleevers not under the Curſe *as the* Curſe, *or revenging puniſhment for ſin*, part 1. *largely diſcuſſed from* p. 24. *to* p. 61.

The Queſtion ſtated, ib. p. 32. &c.

The Reaſons brought by the Proteſtant Writers to prove the Negative againſt the Papiſts, ib. p. 33. to 37.

Mr. Brs *Arguments for the Affirmative*, ib. p. 29—31. *His Arguments anſwered*, ib. p. 38. to 49. *How many wayes popiſh and pernicious this his doctrine is*, ib. p. 49. to 62.

Dar-

D

Darkening *in stead of cleering Truths common to* Mr. Br. *with the Papists*, part 1. p. 5, 9, 10.

The Death *and blood of Christ onely expiatory and satisfactory to Justification*, part 2. p. 64, 65, 67. to 70.

Whether Justification admit of Degrees or magis & minus, *part* 1. p. 286. *to* 291.

Whether the Devil *shall manage the accusation of men in the day of Judgement*, part 1. p. 281.

Distinctions *in Divine matters not grounded upon the word*, viz. *Arts & Sophistry*.

Doctrines *not to be judged of after the personall splendour of their Authors*, pref. p. 4, 5.

Doe, viz. *Life and* Live.

E

Whether it be Easie *to perswade men to embrace Justification by Faith, but difficult by works*, part 2. p. 181. *to* 184.

Sanctification a sure Evidence *of Justification, & so convertibly*, pa. 2. 176. to 178.

In what respects good works do so Evidence, *ib.*

F

Faith *without works not competent to justifie according to* Mr. Br. part 2. p. 4.

How farre he followeth the Papists in the doctrine of implicit Faith, part 1. p 1, 2, 3, &c.

His doctrine herein directly pointed against the Protestants, ib. p. 4.

We must not admit doctrine of Faith *upon the authority of our Teachers*, ib. p. 6.

The evils attending the doing thereof, ib. p. 7, 8.

Mr. Brs *wild and irregular definition of* Faith *to prove justification by works discovered to be ridiculous*, pa. 2. p. 56. &c.

The doctrine of the Protestants about Faith *and works*, part 2. p. 174. &c.

What Mr. Br. *meaneth by* Faith *or his* To credere, part 2. p. 71. &c.

How different Mr. Brs *sense is from some of the Protestant writers, that with him call* Faith *the Condition of justification*, part 1. p. 349, 350.

Forgiving *of others not a Condition of Gods justifying and forgiving us*, part 2. p. 31, 33, &c. to the 37.

Mr. Brs Fraud *in hiding all that the protestants have written against his popish doctrines*, part 2. p. 17, 18. 128, 129.

G

The Genius *of men when conspiring, is apt to draw each other into truth or error*, pref. p. 10, 11.

By what means the Gospel *was so much and so suddenly propagated at the beginning of the Reformation by* Luther, pref. p. 39, 40.

How the further propagation of it was stopped, ib. p. 40, 41.

Gospel *Comforts are Antidotes against sin and carnall liberty, not fomenters of it*, par. 2. p. 162, 163, 167, 168.

Mr. Brs *Reasons to prove his doctrines not to be legall and against the* Gospel, *examined*, part 2. p. 266. to p. 276.

Whether or in what respects Christ hath or hath not satisfied for sins against the Gospel as for sins against the Law. p. 1. p. 219-227

Whether works as holpen by Grace *justifie*, part 1. p. 139. to 143. Mr. Br. *& the papists vainly make this their common plea, to excuse their arrogance in ascribing justification to works*, ib. p. 175, 176

H

Whether *beleevers ought to serve for fear of* Hell, part 2. p. 155—157.

Hiding, viz. Fraud.

I

What the judgment of many learned protestant Divines hath been and is about justification as an Immanent and eternal act in God, part 1. p. 231. to 238.

What Scriptures they bring to prove the affirmative, ib. p. 238. to 247. Mr. Br's dispute against them examined, ib. p. 248—262.

Faith the Instrument of justificati.n, p. 1. p. 330. And the same both Gods and mans Instrument, and in what sense each is such, ib. p. 332, 334, 336, to 341. Mans Instrument, 334—336. 342—348. Mr. Br's cavils against this doctrine answered, ib. p. 358. to 361. 364. to 368. 370.

Whether believers as well as the reprobates shall be judged for & according to their works in the last day, largely discussed against Mr. Br. p. 2. p. 124—136.

Whether the Scriptures which speak in the future tense of justifying, do denote the day of Judgment, p. 1. p 278—280.

Judgment, viz. Devil. 282.

The State of the question between Mr. Br and the Protestants, about Justification by works, Part 2. p. 4, 5, 6.

Justification by works denyed, ibid. &c.

Scriptures produced to prove that Workes have no part with Faith in justifying, ibid. p. 10. to 17.

The Scriptures cited by Mr. Br to prove the contrary assertion examined, ibid. Chap. 3.

Whether according to his own principles he rightly calleth Faith the more and works the less principall Condition of Justification, ibid. p. 49.-51 & 278, 279. And if so, whether this proveth that when we are said to be justified by Faith onely, we are said to be justified by works also, and yet justified by Faith alone. ibid.

Or whether the Reducibleness of all works to faith in some kinde prove it, ibid. p. 49, 50, 52, 53--56. & 278, 279.

Justification considerable in 3 respects, 1 in God, 2 in Christ, 3 in our own persons, and how in every of these. Part 1. p. 89 -91.

Mr. Brs distinction of justification and pardon, into Title of Law, and sentence of Judgement, Constitutive and Declarative; virtuall and Actuall; examined and proved unscripturall and vain: and his reasons to prove a Justification in the day of Judgement, answered, Part 1. p. 277. to the 286.

More of Justification, see Bellarmine, Repentance, Faith, Works, Condition, Scripture, Lord, Prayer, Forgiving, Love, Esse, Christ, Papists, Paul, Cozen, Grace, Causes, Reconciliation, Degrees.

K.

The kingdome and pardon of God and of Christ, are one and the same. Part 1. p. 228, 229.

L.

Whether beleevers are under the Law as a Covenant of works, largely discussed against Mr. Br. part 1. p. 61--to 97.

Protestants reasons for the Negative, ibid. p. 62--66. Mr. Br's Sophistry in stating the question, ibid. p. 66--70.

The Law not repealed as a Covenant of Works to any, but (in a right sense) nulld to beleevers, part 1. p. 71- 74.

The

The vanity of the distinctions & fallaciousnes of the Arguments which Mr. Br brings to prove the Affi mative. ibid. p. 75. to the 97

Many abuse the Law *in preaching it first not onely to kill, but then also to make alive again.* Pref. p. 11, 12.

Distinguishing the same works into works of the Law *and works of the Gospel, viz Paul and Moral.*

Law-giver, *vid. Lord.*

Legal or Law-*teacher, vid. Gospel.*

Secular Learning, *see Arts, Sophistry, Tertullian, Bullinger.*

The doctrine of Faith gives not the Reins to carnall Liberty. Part 2. p. 286. to the 295

The doctrine of Mr. Br *so accusing it, doth so.* ibid. p. 170, 171, *&c.*

Do and Live, *whether and in what respects the voyce of the Gospel; and in what sense, to work for* Life, *not from* Life, *or from* Life *not for* Life, *are either and both sound doctrine.* Part 2. p. 137. to the 153. *&* 158. Part 1. p. 179.

Whether Christ Justifie as our Lord *and* Law-giver, *and that it follow thence, we are justified by works as well as by Faith.* Part 2. p. 64. to the 84.

How farr and in what sense onely the affirmative may be granted. ibid. p. 79.

The question stated, ibid. p. 65.

Mr. Baxters *Arguments to prove the affirmative, answered,* ibid. p. 71. to 84.

Whether Love *cooperate with Faith in Justifying.* Part 2. p. 37. 40.

Our Acting from Love *to God, denieth not a regular* Love *to our selves.* Part 2. p. 293, 294.

M.

Mr. Brs Magisteriall *and usurped Authority in saying without proving.* Part 2 p. 252, 253.

Marks, *vid. Evidences.*

Metaphysicks, *see Arts.*

Mr. Brs *doctrine of* Merits *examined in which he shews himself as high-flown a Papist as any of the Jesuits.* Part 1. p. 186. to the 194.

An Admonition to such Ministers *as inconsiderately suck up Mr.* Brs *doctrines,* Part 1. p 59, 60.

What the Moral *Law is as considered in it self, and in what sense taken:* Part 1. p. 197-199.

What Relation it hath to the severall Covenants. ibid. p. 201, 202, *&c.*

Why the Gospel continues it as a Rule, and that it can be no more repealed or abrogated than God, un-Godded. ibid. p. 199, 200, 203--206.

N.

Novelty or Newnes *of words and phrases used oft for the Ushering in of errors.* Part 1. p. 128, 129.

O.

Obscuring, *see Darkening.*

How all the Offices of Christ concur in our Justification, yet nothing concludible thence for Justification by works. Part 2. p. 63, 64.

Origen *how great a* Scholar, *and how great an abuser of his Learning and corrupter of the Gospel.* Pref. p. 33, 34.

P.

Whether our doctrine by excluding works from justifying, be a stumbling block to Papists, *hindering their conversion, and an occasion given to many learned men to turn* Papists, *and therefore unsound.* Part 2. p. 188—to 197.

Mr.

Mr. Brs *doctrine compared with the worst of the* Papists, *and found one and the same with theirs.* Part 2. p. 215. to p. 222

His doctrine compared with such of the Papists *as write more moderately, & found worse than theirs.* ibid. p. 213. to the 229.

Whether his doctrine contradicts Pauls, *or not,* ibid. p. 234. to the 238.

His first Reason refuted (viz. that Pauls *question was, what is the proper Righteousness by which we are justified, but his own, by what means we may attain this Righteousness, though they answer differently to these differing questions, they consent in Judgements)* ibid. p. 239 to the 250.

His 2 reason that Paul *excludes the works of the Law, not of the Gospel, vain and Popish.* ibid. p. 251. to the 257.

His 3 reason that Paul *under the word Faith, implyeth works and obedience, vitious in the same kinde with the former.* ibid. p. 257, 258.

It is no sound reason that Christ commands not the Perfect *Righteousness of the Law, because Mr.* Br *seeth no Reason why he should require what he enableth no man to perform,* Part 1. p. 215-217

What Reasons thereof may be given. ibid. p. 216, 217.

Perfect, *See* Sincere *and* Righteousness.

Person, *vid. Work.*

Philosophy, *vid. Arts.*

Whether Mr. Brs *doctrine be (as he contendeth) free from* Popery. Part. 2. p. 209, to 215.

Whether it be possible *for us to perform a Righteousness perfect to Justification.* Part 1. p. 194-196.

Whether and in what sense Praying *for* pardon, *may be said to be a condition of pardoning and justifying.* Pa. 2. p. 31-33

Promises *see* Qualifie.

Punish *and* Punishment, *vid. Curse and Affliction.*

Whether Mr. Br *hold for* Purgatory Part 1. p. 54-56.

Q

Promises of life made to persons so and so Qualified, *describe the Justified, but demonstrate not for what they are justified.* Part 2. p. 40, 41. 269.

Rules given by our Divines for the right understanding of such promises to persons of such qualifications P. 2. p. 112, &c.

Quotations *without the words of Scripture, or shewing how he would argue thence, why so frequent with Mr.* Br. P. 2. Cha. 2, & 3 *in the beginning thereof.*

R.

Whether Reconciliatiō *denotes the same thing with or different from Remission and Justification.* Part 1. p. 227, 228 308, 309.

Whether and in what Respects sin may be Remitted *before it be committed.* Part 1. p. 310. to the 313.

Whether and in what sense Repentance *may be said to officiat in Justifying.* Par. 2. p. 26. to the 31.

Scripture seemingly asserting it examined, ibid.

What Legal Repentance *is,* ibid. p. 26.

What the life promised and death threatened under the Law to this legal Repentance *are.* ibid. p. 26--28.

What Gospel Repentance *is, and how manifold.* ibid. p. 29-31.

Sometimes one with Faith. ibid. p. 29, 30.

In

In what sense life is promised to it. ibid.
Repentance *either in its large or strict sense, how it giveth life.* ibid. p. 28, 29, 30.
Mr. Brs *doctrine of a twofold* Righteousness, *absolutely necessary to Justification, the one Legal, the other Evangelical; this in our selves, that in Christ: and his Reasons to make good; 1 his phrase, 2 his matter, examined and refelled.* Part 1. p. 119. to p. 143.
His dispute that his doctrine is not derotory to Christ and his Righteousness, *proved fallacious and false.* Part 2. p. 259. to the 265.
Whether Righteousness *be a Reall Being, or else but a Modification of a Being.* Part 1. p. 149, 150. & 159. to 161
Whether the Scripture call men Righteous *only for performing the Conditions of the New Covenant.* Part 1. p. 144. to 163.
Whether the inherent Righteousness *of Beleevers be perfect.* Part 1. p. 181, to the 186.
Whether Faith as our Righteousness *Justifie.* Part 1. p. 366.-368.

S.

What to judge of some passages that fell from Mr. Saltmarsh *his pen.* Part 1. p. 138.
Salvation *twofold, the state of Grace and of Glory.* Part 2. p. 104, 105. *In the former sense it is the same with Justification.* ibid. p. 105. *Whether in the latter sense it runs upon the same Conditions with Justification.* ibid. p. 105 *Mr.* Brs *arguing for the affirmative, proved fallacious and invalid.* ibid. p. 102, oth e 1-1 2.
The Scriptures which he alledged to prove works the condition of Salvation, found incompetent and invalid to prove it. ibid p. 116. to the 123.
How soundly may we argue from Justification to Salvation, *that it is universally conditionall, as convertibly.* p. 1. p. 331.
Satisfaction, *vid. death.*
Schoolmens *Learning and studies described.* Pref. p. 37, 38.
Mr. Br. pretends to admit the Scripture *as Judge in the Controversie of Justification by works, but fallaciously.* Pa. 2. p. 7, 8.
What Scriptures he produceth to prove Justification by works. pa. 2. p. 25, &c.
These all collected by the Papists to his hands. ibid. *These severall* Scriptures *examined whether they make for him.* ibid. p. 25. to the 48.
His calumny that the Protestants wrest, and implyedly that the Papists truly expound the Scriptures. ib. p 9 85, 86, 87, 89.
Whether and in what respects God doth see or not see sinn in his people. Part. 1. p. 70. to 72.
Signes, *vid. Evidences.*
Similies *prove not but illustrate what is proved.* Part 2. p 172.
Sincerity *what it is.* Part 1 p. 210.
Whether the Gospel requires Perfection or sincerity *onely.* ibid. p. 208. to the 217. & Part 1. p. 270.
Reasons ministring doubts of Mr. Baxters *much applauded* sincerity. Pref. p. 5. to the 9.
Mr. Brs oft excusing himself from affectation of Singularity *true, yet examined upon what grounds it is true, and that he doth it.* Part 1. p. 331.

Whether

Whether and how far Mr. Brs *doctrine is tainted with or free from* Socinianism part 2. p. 229. to the 234.
Mr. Brs Sophistry *and the evils thereof discovered*, p. 1. p. 8. to 21. 284. to 281.
Sophisticall *distinctions how pernicious*, part 1. p. 180, 189, 278, 382.
How incoherent with the mind of Christ, ib. p. 350.
Whether to affirm that Christ Suffered *the* idem *for us, denies pardon and free grace*, part 1. 229, 230.

T

Tertullians *judgment of secular intermixed with Divine learning, in Gospel matters*, pref. p. 34, 35.
The Testimonies *of those eminent writers whom* Mr. Br. *citeth as Patrons of his opinion, manifested to be against him not for him*, part 2. p. 197—208.

W

Word *alone competent to determine in Gospel matters*, pref. p. 16, 18. to 21.
Works *and duties co-ordinate with Faith to justifie, according to* Mr. Br. part 2. p. 4. *what duties and* works *these are*, ib. p. 5. *In what consideration and sense he makes them to justifie*, ibid.
How far we are justified by them before men, viz. Charity.
Mr. Brs and the Papists arguing from St. James *for justification by* works, *examined and refelled*, part 2. p. 184 to 102.
His arrogant ascribing to works *under his* Causa sine qua non, *or condition*, part 2. p. 274—276.
Whether when we are said to be justified by Faith, works *be comprized in faith*, part 2. p. 281. to 284.
How apt mans nature is to put it self under the Covenant of works, part 2. p. 285, 286.
Mr. Brs untoward question answered, whether if God had ordained any work *or vertue to justifie, it should not have done it*, part 1. p. 379. &c.
In what sense our Divines say, God justifieth first the person then his actions, pa. 1. p. 193, 194.
Covenant of works, *see* Law.
More of works, *see* Life *and* Live, Grace *and* Justification.
In what sense and respects the Scripture calleth the Saints worthy, part 1 p. 187, 188.

BRITISH MUSEUM 15 61 MAY

FINIS.